DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 095 CG 018 297

AUTHOR Hess, G. Alfred, Jr.; Lauber, Diana
TITLE Dropouts from the Chicago Public Schools: An Analysis of the Classes of 1982, 1983, 1984.
INSTITUTION Chicago Panel on Public School Finances, IL.
PUB DATE 24 Apr 85
NOTE 113p.; Support for this research was provided by Lloyd A. Frey Foundation. Tables may not reproduce well due to small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Age Differences; *Black Students; *Dropout Rate; Dropout Research; *High Risk Students; *High Schools; *Hispanic Americans; Males; Student Attrition
IDENTIFIERS *Chicago Public Schools IL

ABSTRACT

Many studies of high school dropout rates have compared the number of graduates with the number of enrolled freshmen. An adequate representation of the dropout rate, however, must combine all categories of leaving school before graduation, and a longitudinal approach must be employed. A joint venture between the Chicago Panel on Public School Finances and the Department of Research and Evaluation of the Chicago Board of Education was designed to track all entering freshmen who entered a Chicago public school as part of the graduating classes of 1982-1984. Each student's entry was tracked along with information on whether or not he transferred, graduated, was retained, or dropped out. The results indicated that the dropout rate for the class of 1982 was 43 percent, with similar figures estimated for 1983 and 1984. Hispanics and Blacks were the most likely to dropout, with overage males with low reading scores most at risk. Dropout rates at the city's 63 high schools varied considerably, with the lowest rates at the schools with the best reading scores and the fewest overage students. It is the conclusion of this study that the Chicago Public School System operates a two-tiered high school system which concentrates dropout prone students into inner city Black and Hispanic high schools. (The report includes an executive summary with recommendations; a systemwide analysis of the class of 1982 by dropout rate, age, reading score, gender, and race; a school level analysis of outcomes; three year comparisons of the classes of 1982, 1983, 1984; an assessment of the financial impact of dropouts; a description of the study methodology; and various tables and appendices.) (NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258095

CHICAGO PANEL ON PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCES

DROPOUTS FROM

THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

An Analysis of the Classes of:

1982 - 1983 - 1984

G. Alfred Hess, Jr.
Primary Investigator

Diana Lauber
Research Assistant

April 24, 1985

CG 018297

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Alfred Hess, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

53 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 1730 • Chicago, Illinois 60604 • (312) 939-2202

THE CHICAGO PANEL ON PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCES
53 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 1730
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 939-2202

Tee Gallay, President

American Jewish Committee
Aspira Inc., of Illinois
Center for Neighborhood Technology
Citizens Schools Committee
Chicago Region PTA
Chicago Urban League
Community Renewal Society
Designs for Change
Jewish Council on Urban Affairs
Junior League of Chicago, Inc.
Latino Institute
Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law
League of Women Voters of Chicago
Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund
The Woodlawn Organization
Youth Guidance

Support for this research project has been provided by:

LLOYD A FRY FOUNDATION

Support for the Chicago Panel is also provided by:

Foundations:
Chicago Community Trust, Joyce, MacArthur
New World, Woods Charitable Fund

Corporations:
Amoco, Borg Warner, Chicago Tribune
Fel-Pro, Kraft, Northern Trust, Sears,Roebuck

Individual Contributors, Organization Dues, In-Kind Gifts

The Panel expresses its appreciation for the cooperation
of
The Department of Research and Evaluation
Chicago Board of Education

Staff of the Chicago Panel:

G. Alfred Hess, Jr., Executive Director
Diana Lauber, Assistant Director
Claudia Ingram, Program Coordinator
Penelope L. Puhl, Secretary
Howard L. Toney, Student Clerk

ERRATUM:

CHICAGO UNITED WAS INADVERTENTLY OMITTED FROM
OUR LIST OF PANEL MEMBERS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1
Description of Study
Findings
Recommendations

I. INTRODUCTION 15
Definition of the Problem
Objective of this Study

II. SYSTEMWIDE ANALYSIS OF THE CLASS OF 1982. 19
Dropout Rate
Age
Reading Score
Gender
Race
Relationships Among Variables

III. SCHOOL LEVEL ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES, CLASS OF 1982 . .29
Schools With the Highest Dropout Rates
Schools With the Lowest Dropout Rates
Schools in the Mid-Range
Transfer Rates
Incidence of Significant Student Characteristics
District Analysis

IV. THREE YEAR COMPARISONS, CLASSES OF 1982, 1983, 1984 .71
Yearly Comparisons, Systemwide
Yearly Comparisons, School Level

V. ASSESSING THE FINANCIAL IMPACT OF DROPOUTS 97
Costs of Educating Additional Students
Costs to Society of Not Reducing Dropout Rates

VI. METHODOLOGY 111
Longitudinal Study
Data Collection and Data Problems
Definitions
Comparison with the Board's Current Reporting Method

VII. APPENDIX 119

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		
1	Student Outcomes by Reading Score	23
2	High Schools Ranked by Dropout Rate	33
3	The Worst 21 Schools	35
4	The 21 Schools with the Lowest Rates	37
5	The 21 Mid-Range Schools	39
6	High Schools Ranked by Transfer Rate	41
7	Dropout Rates for Original Unit and Transfers	43
8	Dropout Rates for Transfers into Schools	45
9	High Schools Rank Order by Percent Overage	47
10	High Schools Ranked by Class Size	49
11	H.S. Ranked by Percent Normal Reading Scores	51
12	H.S. Profile Ranked by Percent White	54
13	H.S. Outcomes by Race, Ranked by Percent White	56
14	H.S. Profile Ranked by Percent Black	58
15	H.S. Outcomes by Race, Ranked by Percent Black	60
16	H.S. Profiele Ranked by Percent Hispanic	63
17	H.S. Outcomes by Race, by Percent Hispanic	65
18	Schools Organized by District	67
19	Districts Ranked by Dropout Rate	68
20	Districts Organized by Area of City	68
21	Districts Organized by Geography	68
22	Outcomes Entering Students - Special Schools	70
23	H.S. Enrollment Changes: 1982 - 1983 - 1984	77
24	H.S. Changes in the Dropout Rate	79
25	H.S. Ranked by Dropout Rate - Class of 1984	80
26	Changes in Dropout Rates:Reading Categories	82
27	Changes in Dropout Rates:Reading Enrollments	84
28	H.S. Changes in 14 Year Old Entrants	87
29	Racially Changing Schools - Racial Census Data	89
30	Racially Changing Schools - White Outcomes	89
31	Racially Changing Schools - Black Outcomes	91
32	Racially Changing Schools - Hispanic Outcomes	91
33	Changes in Dropout Rates - Ranked by White	94
34	Changes in Dropout Rates - Ranked by Black	95
35	Changes in Dropout Rates - Ranked by Hispanic	96
36	Additional Costs - All Remain in School	102
37	Additional Costs - 50% Remain in School	103
38	Additional Costs - 25% Remain in School	103
39	Earnings Penalty of Not Completing H.S.	105
40	State and Federal Revenues Not Collected	105
41	Cost of Welfare Expenditures - Not Completing	107
42	Estimated Cost of Crime	109
43	Longitudinal vs. Reported Dropout Rates	117

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY

FINDINGS and RECOMMENDATIONS

DROPOUTS FROM
THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

An Analysis of the Classes of:

1982 - 1983 - 1984

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY

Much has been written recently about the Dropout Problem in the Chicago Public Schools. The recent set of reports began with the Citizens Schools Committee's Consumers Guide to Chicago Public High Schools, which portrayed the class enrollment picture for each Chicago High School as a guide to parents about schools with high dropout problems. Father Charles Kyle followed with his doctoral dissertation focusing on two predominantly Hispanic schools (Wells and Clemente). More recently, Designs for Change released a report combining their analysis of the reading scores of graduating seniors with student completion rates at individual schools. (The Chicago Reporter had earlier published its own investigation of the Dropout Problem.) All of these reports used the same methodological approach, comparing the number of graduates with the number of enrolled freshmen. Without access to specific individualized data, this enrollment approach is the best approximation available to outside groups. It cannot discern the effects of students who transfer out of the system, or of the inflation of the size of the freshman class by students retained in that grade from the previous entering classes (as high as 50% at some schools), nor does it account for the students still actively enrolled after their colleagues graduate. Thus, the statistical base of these studies is reliable only at very gross levels. Further, such an approach provides no correlations between students outcomes and the characteristics of the students. State of Illinois student attrition statistics suffer from the same methodological shortcomings.

Traditionally, the Chicago Board of Education has reported Dropout Rates by calculating the number of students recorded explicitly as "Dropouts" as a percentage of all enrolled students (whatever their grade) for that year. The narrow definition of a "Dropout" unrealistically understates the scope of the problem, allowing school officials to use other classifications (e.g., "enlisted", "left because pregnant") to minimize their Dropout Rate. Further, such an approach gives the observer an instant snapshot, but the phenomenon being pictured is actually a four year long process. To adequately represent the Dropout Rate, all categories of leaving school before graduation must be combined, and a longitudinal approach must be employed.

This study takes exactly such an approach. It has been a joint venture between the Chicago Panel on Public School Finances, an independent, non-profit coalition of agencies dedicated to quality public education, and the Department of Research and Evaluation of the Chicago Board of Education. This joint venture combined the public interests of observer organizations and the vast array of student information maintained by the school system, without compromising the confidentiality of any student.

The study tracks all entering freshmen who entered a Chicago Public High School as part of the graduating classes of 1982, 1983, and 1984. It tracks each student's entry, whether or not he/she transferred to another Chicago Public High School, transferred out of the Chicago system, graduated, or dropped out. The study also indicates how many students are still actively enrolled after their colleagues have graduated (about 10%, most of whom finish their high school career within two and a half years of their originally projecrted graduation date). Thus, this method of calculating the Dropout Rate is much more exact than enrollment-based estimates, specifically excluding retained students from previous classes, and specifying the extent of transfers out of the system and students still actively enrolled after the graduation date of their classmates.

Some problems still remain. Computer generated data always suffer from human error in data entry. Thus, some student records are missing information about their gender, others about the individual's race, others on reading scores, etc. However, the number of such missing codes is quite low, for most categories. A more serious problem is encountered in dealing with recorded transfers out of the system. A visual examination of these codes revealed a number of recorded transfers to non-existent destinations or non-accredited or non-school destinations. All such improper codings were manually converted to the status of Dropout for this study. But, even for students transferred to what appear to be valid, accredited destinations, the Board of Education has not verified that all of these actually enrolled at their projected destinations. We recommend that, from this time forward, all students recorded as transfers be verified as enrolled in another accredited high school or be reclassified as a Dropout, for reporting purposes. The Council of Great City Schools recommended such verification be accomplished within 45 days. However, even if 20% of the students recorded as transfers in this study did not arrive, the Dropout Rate would change by less than 1%. Finally, a longitudinal study is only finalized when all students have completed their high school careers. We found that a final cut-off date of September 30th, two years after a class' graduation date, reduces the number of still actively enrolled students to under one-half of one percent (0.5%). This means that final figures for the Class of 1983 and the Class of 1984 will not be available for some time. However, we also found that the Dropout Rate does not vary significantly from the September after graduation, if those actively enrolled are excluded; thus, proximate figures are available for those years.

The Findings and Recommendations of this study are spelled out in the following pages at some length. They may be summarized in this way: The Dropout Rate for the Class of 1982 was 43%, with similar figures estimated for 1983 and 1984. Hispanics and Blacks are most likely to dropout, with overage males with low reading scores, most at risk. The Transfer Rate for students leaving the Chicago Public School system was 9%. Dropout Rates at the city's 63 high schools varied considerably, with the lowest rates at the schools with the students entering with the best reading scores and the fewest overage students. The schools with the worst Dropout Rates lose more than 50% of their students, and even the mid-range schools are significantly below the national average in percent completing school. Rapid racial change did not significantly affect the outcomes of students studied in this project. If all of the Dropouts had been retained until graduation, the cost to the system would have been an additional $3.5 million. It is the conclusion of this study that the Chicago Public School System operates a two-tiered high school system which concentrates dropout prone students into inner city Black and Hispanic high schools.

The recommendations included in this study are as follows:

1. A major assault on the Dropout Problem should be focused on the elementary schools.
2. A new curricular approach and additional educational services must be developed for high school students whose needs and interests are not now being well served.
3. Dropout reduction efforts should focus on bringing elementary students' reading levels up to the normal range.
4. Increased use of grade retention will likely be counter-productive and should not be considered as a way to reduce the Dropout Rate.
5. Special focus must be given to schools which do not do as well as expected with the students they receive.
6. The Board of Education should move immediately to adopt new data management procedures for recording, verifying, and reporting student outcome information similar to the one developed for this study.

FINDINGS

1. THE DROPOUT RATE IN THE CLASS OF 1982 WAS 43%.

The Dropout Rate in the Chicago Public Schools in the Class of 1982 was 43%. This means that, exclusive of transfers to other accredited high schools outside of the Chicago school system, more than two out of every five entering students left school before graduation. The Graduation Rate is the reciprocal of this figure, 57%.

2. HISPANICS AND BLACKS ARE MOST LIKELY TO DROP OUT. AMONG THESE GROUPS, MALES WHO ENTER HIGH SCHOOL OVERAGE AND WITH BELOW NORMAL READING SCORES, ARE MOST AT RISK.

Among the major racial groups in Chicago, Hispanics (47%) and Blacks (45%) had the highest proportion of students drop out. Whites had 35% drop out, but only 19% of Asians did so. Nearly half of all males (49%) drop out, and more than a third of all females (36%) who entered high school in September 1978 left school before graduation. Hispanic males had the highest Dropout Rates (54%), followed closely by Black males (53%). The older a student is when entering high school, the more likely he/she is to drop out; sixteen year olds (two years over normal entry age) had a 69% Dropout Rate, while fifteen year olds (one year overage) drop out at a 60% rate. A quarter of all entering students (26%) enter high school overage. Hispanic overage students dropout less frequently (60% for 16 year olds) than do overage Black students (77%). The more poorly prepared a student is, the more likely it is he/she will drop out; two-thirds of all Dropouts entered high school with reading scores more than two years below normal or missing reading scores. Of the entering class, 53% had reading scores missing or below normal levels. Thus, Hispanic and Black male students, who enter high school overage and with below normal reading scores are most likely to drop out.

3. HALF OF THE REPORTED TRANSFERS WERE IMPROPERLY RECORDED AND MUST BE CONSIDERED DROPOUTS. CORRECTING FOR THIS FACTOR, THE TRANSFER RATE OUT OF THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM INTO ACCREDITED HIGH SCHOOLS IN OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICTS WAS AT MOST 9%.

To date, the Chicago Public Schools have not consistently verified the enrollment of students transfering to other school jurisdictions from the Chicago Public Schools. This makes the use of the "Transfer" leave code subject to abuse by high school principals, counselors, and clerks. A visual examination of transfer destinations revealed a high number of improperly recorded transfers (e.g., to non-degree granting trade training programs or the armed services); these students were reclassified as Dropouts for this analysis. Nine percent

of all entering students were reported to have transfered out of the Chicago Public Schools to other accredited high schools. Transfers have been excluded from Dropout and Graduation Rates. Because the school system currently does not verify the arrival of these transfers, it is impossible to know the outcomes for these students. It is estimated on the basis of our examination that as many as 20% of the remaining Transfers never arrive at their school destination, and should be considered Dropouts. This would raise the Dropout Rate by less than 1%, and decrease the Graduation Rate correspondingly. If as many as 50% did not arrive, the rates would change by two and one half percent.

4. THE PANEL COMPARED STUDENT OUTCOMES FOR THE CLASSES OF 1982, 1983, AND 1984. A NEW PROMOTION POLICY HAS CREATED AN ARTIFICIAL DECREASE IN THE DROPOUT RATE FOR THE CLASS OF 1984. THE EFFECT OF THIS POLICY IS TO REDUCE THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH LOW READING SCORES (DROPOUT PRONE STUDENTS) FOR THIS ONE CLASS ONLY.

When the Classes of 1982, 1983, and 1984 were compared, the Dropout Rate decreased each year, reaching 40% in 1984. However, the Class of 1984 was the first class affected by a new promotion policy which retained low achieving students in elementary school, thus artificially reducing the number of normal aged students entering high school in this class; correspondingly, this policy raised reading scores for the entering class. The resulting decrease in the number of Dropouts which appears in our data was more evident in males, whose rate decreased almost four percentage points (to 46%). Decreases were largest for Hispanics (to 43%) and Blacks (to 42%). The proportion of the entering class who were Hispanic increased by about two percentage points, while the percent Black and White decreased proportionately. The percentage of overage students increased from 26% to 29%; but this proportional change was as a result of decreases in the number of 14 year olds entering high school, not from increases in the number of overaged entrants. It would be expected that the entering Class of 1985 would also show a higher proportion of overage students, this time reflecting higher numbers of that age group. Offsetting these apparent increases in the proportion of students at higher risk, the reading scores of entering students also increased; a higher proportion of entering students in the Class of 1984 read at or above normal levels, as would be expected if low achieving students were retained in elementary school. Because about 10% of all high school students take more than four years to complete their high school careers, final Dropout and Graduation Rates, for longitudinal studies, cannot be accurately established until two years after a class graduates. This fact, together with the effect of the new promotion policy, means that the rates for 1983 and 1984 must be treated cautiously.

5. STUDENTS WHO REMAIN AT ONE SCHOOL FOR THEIR ENTIRE HIGH SCHOOL CAREER DROP OUT MUCH LESS FREQUENTLY THAN THOSE WHO TRANSFER FROM ONE CHICAGO HIGH SCHOOL TO ANOTHER.

The Dropout Rate for students who stay at the high school in which they originally enrolled (40%) was slightly lower than the systemwide rate (43%). The Dropout Rate for students who transferred within the system to another Chicago high school was 16% higher at 56%. Thus, the students who transferred from one high school to another in the system, were more likely to become Dropouts. This differing pattern has implications for special attention when transfering students are received at a high school. Students at predominantly White schools and all-Black schools with the highest Dropout Rates transferred the least. For the most stable schools, the Dropout Rate for transferring students was 22% higher than for students who stayed at those schools.

6. THE NET FINANCIAL COST OF RETAINING ALL DROPOUTS UNTIL GRADUATION WOULD BE AN ADDITIONAL $3.5 MILLION.

Students drop out in increasing numbers as each year of high school passes. By the end of the first year, 7% have dropped out; after two years, another 28%; after three, 30% more; with the final 35% dropping out in their fourth year or later. If all of the Dropouts in the Class of 1982 had remained in school until graduation, the additional costs for teachers, supplies, transportation, and food would have reached $17.4 million, at current costs. However, had those students remained to graduation, they would also have generated additional revenues in state aid and reimbursements totalling $13.9 million. At current cost levels, the net additional cost of eliminating the Dropout problem would be $3.5 million. The Board's estimated costs of a Dropout Prevention plan would add $18.8 million, for total costs of $22.3 million. Against that figure, total lifetime costs to society of the 12,804 Dropouts of the Class of 1982 were estimated to be $451 million in lost tax revenues, welfare payments and the costs of crime.

SCHOOL LEVEL FINDINGS

Sixty-three high schools were analyzed for the classes entering in September 1978, 1979, and 1980. The characteristics of students attending these schools vary significantly by entry age, race, reading scores, and areas of residence in the city. These schools have varied programs for dealing with students: some are technical schools with high scholastic entry requirements, some are vocational schools, some are specialized schools, but most are general high schools. Similarly, these schools have varying success in educating their students. Two primary measures of their success are the Dropout rate and the Graduation rate.

7. THE 21 SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST GRADUATION RATES (THE TOP THIRD OF ALL HIGH SCHOOLS) ACCOUNT FOR NEARLY HALF OF ALL GRADUATES IN THE CLASS OF 1982.

Forty-seven percent of the graduates in the Class of 1982 graduated from just 21 schools, and only a quarter of the students from these schools dropped out. Of these schools, 18 graduated more than two-thirds of their 1978 entering class. Five schools, Bogan, Lane, Taft, Young, and Kenwood, graduated more than 80% of their students. In the top 21 schools, 80% of students completed their high school career at the same school they entered, and students who stay at the same school graduate much more frequently than those who transfer to another Chicago high school. Two of these 21 schools are the system's elite technical schools, six are vocational high schools, and 13 are general high schools.

8. THE SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST GRADUATION RATES RECEIVE THE STUDENTS WITH THE HIGHEST READING SCORES.

The students who entered the top 21 schools differ significantly from systemwide norms. Few of these students (only 13%, half the systemwide norm of 26%) entered high school overage(15 years old or older). 72% of the students entering these schools read at, or above, normal rates. The racial distribution of these students was disproportionately White(34%), with fewer Blacks(57%) and half the average rate of Hispanics(6%). At three of these schools more than 80% of the entering class was White, and eight had a majority of White students in the entering class. At seven of the schools, the entering class was more than 95% Black, while a total of ten had a majority of entering students who were Black. Only Richards Vocational was predominantly (46%) Hispanic, and it was 100% female. Nine of these 21 schools are located on the Fringe of the city, and four are in Lakefront districts. Eight are located in the Inner City, but of these, six are vocational or magnet schools, drawing students from beyond the neighborhoods in which they are located.

9. THE SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST DROPOUT RATES LOSE MORE THAN 50% OF THEIR STUDENTS AS DROPOUTS.

The 21 schools with the highest Dropout Rates all have more dropouts than graduates, and account for 49% of all dropouts from the system. Together, they had 56% of their entering students drop out, and graduated only 44%. Two of these schools are vocational high schools and the rest are general high schools.

10. THE SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST DROPOUT RATES RECEIVE THE STUDENTS WITH THE LOWEST READING SCORES.

The students who attended these 21 schools also differ significantly from systemwide norms. More than a third of their entering students entered high school overage. One of these schools had over 50% of the entering class overage. Seventy percent of the students entering these schools had below normal or were missing reading scores. Two schools had more than four-fifths of their students in this category(Austin, 82%, and Manley, 80%). These students were disproportionately Black(76%); 18% were Hispanic, and only 6% were White. Only one school was majority White, and 16 of the 21 were more than 99% minority. Three schools had a majority of their entering students who were Hispanic(#9--Clemente, #10--Wells, and #21--Juarez). The eight schools with the worst dropout rates were all 99% Black. All but three of these 21 schools are in Inner City Districts and two of the three were in Inner City neighborhoods on the edges of Fringe or Lakefront districts.

11. THE MID-RANGE SCHOOLS PLOD ALONG

The 21 schools in the mid-range between the best schools and the worst are very close to citywide norms. Their composite Dropout Rate (45%) is just above the median(43%). Nationwide, 73% of high school students graduate from high school. Thus, the Dropout Rate, as it has been calculated in this study, is 18% above this national norm for these mid-range schools. The students attending these schools resemble the norms for the system. The distribution of normal age to overage entrants is average for the system(27% overage). 58% of the students attending these schools read below normal rates or had no test scores. Half the schools were in the Inner City and half were on the city Fringe or Lakefront. Racially, however, this group was more heavily White(28%), with fewer Blacks(53%). Six of these schools had a majority White entering class, seven were all Black, and five others were majority Black, three were predominantly Hispanic.

12. AMONG THE SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST DROPOUT RATES IN 1982, THE DROPOUT RATE DECREASED SIGNIFICANTLY AT SOME AND INCREASED SIGNIFICANTLY AT OTHERS FOR THE CLASS OF 1984. IN PART, THESE CHANGES REFLECT DIFFERENTIAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROMOTION POLICY, WHICH CREATED AN ARTIFICIAL DECLINE IN THE SYSTEMWIDE DROPOUT RATE.

At the school level, the largest reductions of the Dropout Rate occurred at Fenger (-16%), Englewood (-12%), and Harlan (-10%), all schools among the group with the highest Dropout Rates for the Class of 1982 and all with high levels of students with Below Normal reading scores in the Class of 1982. Of the 14 schools which reduced their Dropout Rates by more than 5%, eleven were all-minority schools. Nine of these schools had received high proportions of Below Normal reading entrants and nine had Dropout Rates above 50% for the Class of 1982. Thus, these schools were the ones most likely to be affected by the new promotion policy. At ten schools, the Dropout Rate rose by more than 5%. There was virtually no change in the Transfer Rate, systemwide, but at five schools, all majority minority, the Transfer Rate increased by more than 5%.

13. RAPID CHANGE IN THE RACIAL COMPOSITION OF SCHOOLS HAD LITTLE EFFECT ON SCHOOL DROPOUT RATES.

The Racial composition of the Class of 1984 when it entered high school was not significantly different from that of the Class of 1982, except for a significant reduction in White 14 year old entrants. But a new desegregation plan, adopted after the Class of 1984 had begun high school, did create significant school-wide change at a number of schools. Outcomes for Whites and Blacks entering these changing schools in the Class of 1984 did not vary significantly from the Class of 1982. The Hispanic Dropout Rate at these schools declined slightly.

CONCLUSION: THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM OPERATES A TWO-TIERED HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM WHICH CONCENTRATES DROPOUT PRONE STUDENTS INTO INNER CITY BLACK AND HISPANIC HIGH SCHOOLS.

The picture that begins to emerge is that the Chicago Public Schools have two separate and distinct systems:

--High schools for the best prepared students, located in middle-class neighborhoods or drawing the best achieving students away from Inner City neighborhood schools, and

--High schools for the Inner City which receive a disproportionately high number of overage students reading below normal levels.

It appears that, for the freshmen entering high school in September 1978, the system was functioning under an operative policy of EDUCATIONAL TRIAGE, in which some schools were designed to save the best students, some were designed to be holding pens for the worst prepared students, and a small mid-range just plodded along.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A NEW CURRICULAR APPROACH AND ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES MUST BE DEVELOPED FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS WHOSE NEEDS AND INTERESTS ARE NOT NOW BEING WELL SERVED.

For the last few years, the emphasis has been upon creating excellent academic programs at some schools which have become attractive to the best achieving students. However, this has created a high school system in which the best prepared students congregate into these most attractive schools and poorly prepared students are abandoned in, and drop out from, the worst schools. A new approach must be taken for the schools receiving these poorly prepared students, if the Dropout Rate is to be reduced. A whole new curriculum is required for those students, a curriculum which will include basic literacy and skills needed for jobs in a changing economy and which is geared to the socio- economic background of these poorly prepared students. High schools must adapt to serve the needs of these students, rather than expect these students to adapt to or drop out from schools as they are currently structured. Relatively few students drop out from the elite schools; focusing more effort and resources on these schools will only marginally affect the Dropout Rate.

2. A MAJOR ASSAULT ON THE DROPOUT PROBLEM SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

The overwhelming evidence from this study indicates that Chicago high schools generally do well when they receive well-prepared students, those with reading scores at or above normal levels and at a normal age. When students are poorly prepared, Dropout Rates soar. The schools with the worst Dropout Rates receive prohibitively high proportions of their students who cannot read English at normal rates, and far too many who are already overage. Much of the current effort at Dropout reduction focuses on ameliorative efforts at the high schools, but the data from this study indicate that such attention at the high school level is too late. The Dropout problem is not amenable to quick fix solutions, but will require a number of years to alter. Progress can be measured by increasing reading scores of entering students, and a reduction in the number of overage entrants.

3. DROPOUT REDUCTION EFFORTS SHOULD FOCUS ON BRINGING ELEMENTARY STUDENTS ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS UP TO THE NORMAL RANGE.

The single most important factor which varied correspondingly with the Dropout Rate was the proportion of students entering high school with reading scores at, or above, normal rates. Schools with high proportions of entrants reading at, or above, normal have low Dropout Rates; those with low levels of normal reading entrants have high Dropout Rates. Further, when the reading scores of entering students improved, the Dropout Rate declined. Thus, an effective Dropout prevention strategy must focus on raising the level of preparedness of entering high school students without raising the level of overage entrants.

4. INCREASED USE OF GRADE RETENTION WILL LIKELY BE COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE AND SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AS A WAY TO REDUCE THE DROPOUT RATE.

Overwhelmingly, students entering high school overage drop out. Three-quarters of all students two years overage drop out, and three-fifths of all students one year overage do the same. By retaining eighth grade students and preventing them from entering high school in the Class of 1984, the Dropout Rate for that year was arbitrarily lowered, but the rate for the Class of 1985 can be expected to be correspondingly higher as a higher proportion of entrants would then be overage. Increasing the number of overage students by elementary grade retention is only likely to increase the Dropout Rate. Even overage students reading one whole level higher than their normal age counterparts drop out more frequently, negating any presumed benefit of retention.

5. SPECIAL FOCUS MUST BE GIVEN TO SCHOOLS WHICH DO NOT DO AS WELL AS EXPECTED WITH THE STUDENTS THEY RECEIVE.

It is unrealistic to expect Crane High School, which received 60% of its entering students reading below normal levels and 38% who were overage, to have as high a Graduation Rate as Lane Tech, with none of its students reading below normal rates, and only 3% overage. But 18 other schools received a higher proportion of their students reading below normal and yet had lower Dropout Rates than did Crane. Similar conditions exist at several other schools. These units must receive special attention from District Superintendents, or, if these officials are consumed by their responsibilities for elementary schools (they have 20 to 25 elementary schools and only two or three high schools in their districts), special area high school superintendents might be created to provide this attention. However, since the preparedness of students entering high school is the primary predictor of Dropout Rates, the current arrangement seems to be more logical.

6. THE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD MOVE IMMEDIATELY TO ADOPT NEW DATA MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES FOR RECORDING, VERIFYING, AND REPORTING STUDENT OUTCOME INFORMATION SIMILAR TO THOSE EMPLOYED IN THIS STUDY.

This study has established the basic student tracking procedures for longitudinally compiling and reporting Dropout, Graduation, and Transfer Rates for all students in an entering class. This way of reporting the data makes clear what happens to students through their high school career, and helps to pinpoint the places where extra effort is most needed. We recommend the Board adopt procedures similar to those used in this study to report Dropout data in the future. Individual student information should be maintained from entry into the Chicago Public Schools. At entry into high school, an unalterable class code (the projected graduation date for that entering class) should be entered on the student's record. Achievement scores should be included on the student information file. We further strongly recommend the Board adopt for immediate implementation a policy of verifying all transfers out of the system. Before a student is considered to have transferred out of the Chicago system, verification from a certified high school in another school district should be obtained confirming he has actually been enrolled in that school. Students who are no longer enrolled in Chicago schools but for whom no such verification can be obtained should be considered Dropouts. The school district should make this data available to interested members of the public in a manner that protects individual rights of privacy and facilitates analysis. Computerized data tapes are one key format in which basic data should be available for analysis.

I. INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Nationwide, the number of students who enter high school but do not graduate has declined for nearly a century. National statistics indicate that 73% of all high school students graduate(U.S. Education Department, 1985). However, that figure represents a slight decrease since 1968. In an economy in which jobs for non-high school graduates were plentiful, the Dropout Rate was accorded only moderate significance. On the other hand, in an economy in which reasonably compensated unskilled jobs are disappearing, Dropouts become a major factor in public policy. The research cited in this study shows that Dropouts earn significantly less than high school graduates and pay significantly less in taxes. Dropouts are far more dependent on welfare and unemployment assistance, and much more likely to participate in criminal activity than high school graduates. Perhaps more importantly, individual Dropouts have significantly fewer opportunities open to them, and run a higher risk of facing a life of poverty. Yet little is known about the extent of the Dropout problem nor the places to attack the problem if the political will were present to do so. This study brings some precision to defining the scope and locus of the problem.

The recent spate of education reports has focused the attention of the nation on reform which will produce excellence in the nation's schools. Lost in this movement are the students most at risk of failing in, and being failed by, the American education system. During the previous two decades, there was much attention given to assuring equality of access to an adequate education for all young people. Many changes happened in the schools of the nation, but it can hardly be maintained that equality of educational opportunity has been achieved. But falling test scores and other problems have led to shifting the emphasis to issues of excellence. Yet even this strategy seems curiously short-sighted. The quickest way to improve reading capacities of the nation's young people is to help those currently at the lower levels. Large gains among presently poorly performing students will raise the functional literacy of the citizenry, which is more significant than small gains, which are much harder to achieve, among the students already doing well. In the process, Dropout Rates might also be reduced, accomplishing two goals at once.

Dropout rates are generally conceded to be much higher for urban centers with high concentrations of economically disadvantaged and non-white students. School systems in these areas are also generally more strapped for resources than are surrounding suburban systems, despite the 1971 Sorrano California court decision for equity of funding. Cibulka, in

a study of the schools of Wisconsin ("State Level Policy Options for Dropout Prevention," 1985), recently found that systems which were short of resources generally required additional funds to significantly reduce their Dropout Rates.

But determining what the Dropout Rate is is one of the first problems facing those seeking to reduce it. Current methods of determining the Dropout Rate hide, rather than highlight, the problem. The Chicago Board of Education maintains an official Dropout Rate which is the percentage of students enrolled in high school who drop out during any particular year. But determining which students to count as Dropouts is also a problem. The Board has some 20 "leave codes" which record categories of leaving school, only one of which is "Dropout". Yet at least 13 of these codes refer to students who leave school without graduating (ranging from "Needed at home" to "Lost" or "Cannot adjust"). A reasonable Dropout Rate would include all of these categories; such an approach would dramatically increase the "official rate" for a number of Chicago high schools.

What people really want to know is what percentage of students entering high school graduate, and what percent are Dropouts? This information cannot be discovered using the current method of recording Dropouts. A longitudinal approach is required to answer those questions. Entering students must be tracked through their high school career, from entry to departure. This is a more taxing procedure than simply adding up the number of students recorded as Dropouts and dividing by the beginning of the year enrollment at all high schools. The longitudinal approach produces an accurate picture of how many entering students actually graduate, how many drop out, and, incidently, how many transfer to another school or transfer out of the system entirely.

The objective of this study was to do a longitudinal study of all entering freshmen who belonged to the Classes of 1982, 1983, and 1984, to track their high school careers to final departure from the Chicago public school system, to determine how many transferred out of the system, and of those remaining, to identify how many were graduates and how many were Dropouts. At the same time, procedures would be established which would allow the Chicago Board of Education to analyze and report data on the Dropout Rate (and correspondingly, the Graduation Rate) for each ensuing class. This study has also sought to identify the sites with the highest Dropout Rates, and the characteristics of the students who most frequently were Dropouts, so that efforts to reduce the Dropout Rate might be more effective.

II. SYSTEMWIDE ANALYSIS OF THE CLASS OF 1982

II. THE CLASS OF 1982

The Dropout Rate from Chicago Public High Schools for the Class of 1982 was 43%. Exclusive of students who transfered to other accredited high schools outside the Chicago public school system, more than two out of every five entering students left school before graduation. Fifty-seven percent (the reciprocal figure) graduated. Nine percent of all entering freshmen transfered out of Chicago schools to other accredited schools, though it is unverified that those students actually enrolled in the schools to which they were transfered.

In the fall of 1978, 33,142 students entered Chicago high schools. These students became the Class of 1982. On September 30, 1984, 140 of these students were still actively enrolled in the Chicago school system. 3,060 (9.3%) students transferred out of the Chicago system. Thus, the base of continuing students who either graduated or dropped out was 29,942.

Entering Students	Still Active	Transfers	Continuing Students
33,142	140	3,060	29,942

Among the continuing students (those who entered a Chicago public high school and completed their high school career in the system), 12,804 (42.8%) were Dropouts. Correspondingly, 17,138 students (57.2%) of the Class of 1982 graduated. If the national Dropout Rate can be estimated at 27% (see U.S. Department of Education, 1985--the definition of "Dropout" may differ in these two studies; thus, these figures may not be comparable), then Chicago's Dropout Rate is more than one and one-half times the national rate.

A number of specific student characteristics were examined for patterns among the Class of 1982. Significant differences in Dropout Rates were discovered when the class was analyzed by age of entry, by eighth grade reading score, by gender, and by race.

AGE

Most entering high school freshmen are 14 years old. In the Class of 1982, 71% were 14. The next largest group was 15 years old (23%), while a few (3%) were 13 or younger, and about the same were 16 or older. The Transfer Rate was fairly constant for all age groups. As the age of entering students rose, the Dropout Rate rose accordingly:

Age	Entering Students	Transfers & Actives	Continuing Students	Dropouts	Dropout Rate
13-	1,064	105	959	249	26.0%
14	23,626	2,283	21,343	7,902	37.0%
15	7,472	717	6,755	4,044	59.9%
16+	980	95	885	609	68.8%

Thus, the older a student was at entry into high school, the more likely it was that he/she would become a Dropout. A quarter of all entering students in the Class of 1982 were overage. Although there were relatively few students who entered high school at 16 years old or more, more than two-thirds of these students dropped out. However, the major jump in the Dropout Rate was between students 14 and 15 years of age. The Rate increased by 23 percentage points between those two ages. Three out of five students who entered one year overage dropped out. Thus, whatever benefit might have been derived by spending additional years in elementary school, for these students, being overage at entry into high school was a clear predictor of the likelihood of dropping out.

READING SCORE

Not surprisingly, the better a student's reading score in eighth grade, the better his chances of graduating; conversely, the lower the reading score, the higher the Dropout Rate:

Stanine	Grade Equivalent	Dropout Rate	Level
1	0.5 - 4.6	67.8%	Below Normal
2 & 3	4.7 - 6.7	49.9%	
4	6.8 - 8.0	39.3%	
5	8.1 - 9.2	28.0%	Normal
6 & up	9.3 -13.9	18.8%	and Above

National norm referenced tests consider Stanines 4, 5, and 6 as normal reading levels (see Chapter VI for a discussion of reading scores). When the outcomes of all students scoring at Stanine 5 and above (i.e., at or above grade level) are combined, their Dropout Rate is 23%, slightly below the national average for <u>all</u> students (27%).

However, reading score statistics must be examined more closely. A significant number, 3,854 (11.6%), of entering students have no reading score on their file. There are several reasons why these students might not have a recorded score: not attending a Chicago elementary school before enrolling in a Chicago high school, limited English proficiency, absence on the testing day, and coding mismatches in merging two separate computer files, to mention a few. Transiency, students who transfer into the Chicago system, and then quickly transfer back out, is a major reason for missing

DROPOUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Class of 1982 - Six Year Time Frame
READING SCORES

TABLE 1
OUTCOMES BY READING SCORES

ALL STUDENTS	Entering Students	Percent of Students w/ scores	Still Active	Transfer Students	Transfer Rate	Remaining Students	Percent of Remaining Students	Number Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Stanine 1	3,851	13.1%	31	335	8.7%	3,485	13.0%	2,364	67.8%
Stanine 2 & 3	9,838	33.6%	59	809	8.2%	8,970	33.6%	4,479	49.9%
Stanine 4	6,820	23.3%	15	539	7.9%	6,266	23.5%	2,463	39.3%
Stanine 5	4,248	14.5%	7	374	8.8%	3,867	14.5%	1,083	28.0%
Stanine 6+	4,531	15.5%	7	401	8.9%	4,132	15.5%	777	18.8%
Sub-Totals	29,288		119	2,458	8.4%	26,720		11,166	41.8%
w/o scores	3,854	(11.6%)	21	613	15.9%	3,222	(10.8%)	1,638	50.8%
Grand Totals	33,142		140	3,071	9.3%	29,942		12,804	42.8%

SUMMARY - ALL STUDENTS									
w/o scores	3,854	(11.6%)	21	613	15.9%	3,222	(10.8%)	1,638	50.8%
Below Normal	13,689	46.7%	90	1,144	8.4%	12,455	46.6%	6,843	54.9%
Normal Plus	15,599	53.3%	29	1,314	8.4%	14,266	53.4%	4,323	30.3%

MALES									
Stanine 1	2,233	15.2%	22	195	8.7%	2,016	15.1%	1,438	71.3%
Stanine 2 & 3	4,975	33.8%	44	430	8.6%	4,501	33.7%	2,573	57.2%
Stanine 4	3,254	22.1%	10	256	7.9%	2,988	22.3%	1,359	45.5%
Stanine 5	2,025	13.8%	5	174	8.6%	1,846	13.8%	592	32.1%
Stanine 6+	2,230	15.2%	4	203	9.1%	2,023	15.1%	466	23.0%
Sub-Total	14,717		85	1,258	8.5%	13,374		6,428	48.1%
w/o scores	2,120	(12.6%)	13	339	16.0%	1,768	(11.7%)	1,022	57.8%
Male Totals	16,837		98	1,597	9.5%	15,142		7,450	49.2%

FEMALES									
Stanine 1	1,618	11.1%	9	140	8.7%	1,469	11.0%	926	63.0%
Stanine 2 & 3	4,863	33.4%	15	379	7.8%	4,469	33.5%	1,906	42.6%
Stanine 4	3,566	24.5%	5	283	7.9%	3,278	24.6%	1,104	33.7%
Stanine 5	2,223	15.3%	2	200	9.0%	2,021	15.1%	491	24.3%
Stanine 6+	2,301	15.8%	3	198	8.6%	2,109	15.8%	311	14.7%
Sub-Total	14,571		34	1,200	8.2%	13,346		4,738	35.5%
w/o scores	1,734	(10.6%)	8	274	15.8%	1,454	(9.8%)	616	42.4%
Female Totals	16,305		42	1,474	9.0%	14,800		5,354	36.2%

scores. Those without scores transfer out of the Chicago system at almost double the rate of all other students (15.9% vs. 8.4% -- Transfer Rates for students with recorded reading scores varied by less than one percent). Of the continuing students without scores, more than half (51%) were Dropouts. Their outcomes were similar to those of students reading at below normal levels, in the second and third stanines.

The distribution of reading scores for Chicago's students is considerably lower than would be expected for a norm referenced test:

Stanine	Continuing Students	Percent	Dropouts	Dropout Rate	Level
1	3,485	13%	2,364	67.8%	Below
2 & 3	8,970	34%	4,479	49.9%	Normal
4	6,266	24%	2,463	39.3%	Normal
5	3,867	14%	1,083	28.0%	and
6 & up	4,132	15%	777	18.8%	Above
Without Scores	3,222	-	1,638	50.8%	

Nearly half (47%) of all Chicago students with reading scores are reading below normal levels (below Stanine 4, grade equivalent of 6.8)! If the students without reading scores are combined with those without scores, they comprised 53% of all students who remained at Chicago high schools. Only 47% of the entering freshman class read at or above normal levels! The aggregate Dropout Rate for those without reading scores or reading below normal levels was 54%. The Dropout Rate for those reading at, or above, normal levels is 30% (still 3% above the national average for all students). Thus, even students reading at normal levels drop out of Chicago schools at much higher rates than nationally, a trait common to large urban school districts.

GENDER

There were about 500 more males than females among the students entering high school with the Class of 1982. Males were much more likely to be Dropouts; 58% of all Dropouts were male:

Gender	Continuing Students	Dropouts	Percent of Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Male	15,142	7,480	58%	49.2%
Female	14,800	5,354	42%	36.2%

Nearly half of all males dropped out of the Chicago high schools. Just over a third of all females were Dropouts.

RACE

Dropout Rates varied significantly among members of differing racial/ethnic groups. Transfer Rates also varied significantly. In the Class of 1982, 63% of the entering freshmen were Black, 22% were White, 14% were Hispanic, 2% were Asian, and 0.1% were American Indian or Pacific Islander. The small number of students who were classed as American Indian makes comparisons with the other racial groups inappropriate. Caution must also be taken in making comparisons for Asians. The Dropout Rates for each race are:

Race	Continuing Students	Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Hispanic	~~6,279~~ 3,852	1,807	46.9%
Black	19,153	8,640	45.1%
White	6,279	2,169	34.5%
Asian	531	103	19.4%

Transfer Rates were highest for Asians (14.4%) and Hispanics (13.6%), lower for Whites (11.2%), and significantly lower for Blacks (7.2%).

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG VARIABLES

When these variables are brought together, some significant differences appear. It has already been noted that males drop out almost half again as often as females. When reading scores are compared for males and females, there are only slight differences. The percentage of males with scores in Stanine 1 is about four points higher than for females; correspondingly, the rates for females in Stanines 4, 5, and 6 and above are slightly higher than for males. However, these differences are very slight:

Stanine	Percent of All Males	Percent of All Females
1	15%	11%
2 & 3	34%	33%
4	22%	25%
5	14%	15%
6 & up	15%	16%
	100%	100%

The Dropout Rates for males and females in each Stanine vary correspondingly with the overall difference in Dropout Rates for the sexes. Thus, the small differences in reading scores between males and females does not account for the differences in Dropout Rates between the genders:

Stanine	Male Dropout Rate	Female Dropout Rate
1	71.3%	63.0%
2 & 3	57.2%	42.6%
4	45.5%	33.7%
5	32.1%	24.3%
6 & up	23.0%	14.7%

However, when Gender is compared with entry age, some significant differences are noted:

Age	Males	Females
Normal	70%	80%
Overage	30%	20%

A higher proportion of males enter high school overage. It has already been noted that overage students are much more likely to dropout than are normal aged students. The Dropout Rates for each age level of males and females vary proportionally, but at a smaller margin than between males an females overall:

Age	Male Dropout Rate	Female Dropout Rate
13-	31.2%	22.5%
14	42.8%	31.8%
15	63.9%	54.0%
16+	71.1%	64.0%
Overall	49.2%	36.2%

The picture which begins to emerge is that males, while reading only slightly below females, are half again as likely to enter high school overage. This seems to indicate differential treatment of males in the elementary schools, a phenomenon which has been frequently noted in the national research literature. The higher frequency of overage males, together with higher Dropout Rates at each suceeding age, account for some of the differences in Dropout Rates between the sexes.

When Age and Reading Scores are compared, another significant finding appears. If grade retention were a successful strategy, one would expect students to gain in reading level during the repeated year. If this approach were to improve the chances of graduation, a gain of one stanine should result in a lower Dropout Rate for the next higher age group than for the lower reading level for normal aged entrants. In fact, the opposite is the case. The Dropout Rate for overage students in the next higher stanine is worse than for that of lower reading normal age students. Overage students do more poorly than do normal age students, even when they read at higher levels:

	Normal Age Dropout Rate	Overage Dropout Rate
Stanine 1	62.1%	73.2%
Stanines 2&3	46.1%	57.5
Stanine 4	36.3%	52.5%
Stanine 5	27.0%	43.8%
Stanine 6 up	18.3%	37.9%

Thus, grade retention works to increase the Dropout Rate.

When Gender is compared with Race, further differences are noted. For all races, males dropout more frequently than do females, but the differences are larger among Blacks and Hispanics:

Race	Male Dropout Rate	Female Dropout Rate
Hispanic	53.7%	39.3%
Black	52.5%	37.8%
White	38.8%	30.1%
Asian	23.2%	14.6%

The difference between Hispanic and Black males and females is over 14 percentage points, while the differences between White and Asian males and females is just over 8 points. Hispanic and Black males were significantly more likely to become Dropouts than were any other group. The Dropout Rate for White males and Hispanic and Black females were similar. White females rates were lower, followed by Asian males; the lowest rates were attributable to Asian females.

Finally, when Age and Race are compared, other important facts appear. Ethnicity, particularly linguistic ethnicity, appears to have a confounding effect on Dropout Rates by age. Asians and Hispanics have higher proportions of their entering students who are overage, while their overage Dropout Rates are considerably lower than those for Blacks. Asian patterns are particularly interesting because the Dropout Rate nearly triples for entering students who are 16 or older. However, the small number of cases for 16+ Asians means caution should be exercised here.

Age	Black		White		Hispanic		Asian	
	%	Dropout Rate	%	Dropout Rate	%	Dropout Rate	%	Dropout Rate
13-	3%	28%	3%	23%	3%	22%	6%	9%
14	70%	39%	81%	31%	62%	42%	59%	14%
15	24%	63%	15%	55%	28%	56%	25%	22%
16+	3%	77%	1%	56%	7%	60%	9%	57%

Eighty-four percent of Whites enter at normal ages, as do 73% of Blacks; Hispanics and Asians have only 65% of their students enter at normal age. While Hispanics and Blacks have similar Dropout Rates for normal aged students, Black overage entrants are much more likely to dropout than are Hispanic overage entrants. Hispanic overage Dropout Rates approximate those of Whites. It may be that the higher proportion of overage Hispanics is a result of language-learning delays which do not carry the same stigma for overage students as pertains for Blacks and Whites. However, it should be noted that for Blacks, Whites and Hispanics, entering high school overage meant more than half would become Dropouts! Overage Blacks had only one chance in four of graduating in the Class of 1982, and for overage Black males, it was less than one in five!

However, percentages aside, when absolute numbers are examined, the overage Black student claims major attention. Of the 5,048 Blacks who entered high school overage in the Class of 1982; 3,233 became Dropouts! That figure represents 25% of all Dropouts from the Class of 1982. These students represent the single largest target group for preventive measures. If effective measures could be designed to reduce the number of Black students falling behind in the system's elementary schools and new and effective means be designed for meeting the special needs of these students when they do get to high school, a significant reduction of the Dropout Rate should be feasible. Similar programs could be designed for Hispanics and Whites who currently enter high school overage. Unfortunately, current policy of the Chicago Board of Education seems designed to increase the number of overage entrants while continuing to neglect their special needs when they get to high school!

III. SCHOOL LEVEL ANALYSIS

CLASS OF 1982

III. SCHOOL LEVEL ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES
Class of 1982

The systemwide Dropout Rate is 43%, but Dropout Rates vary considerably among individual high schools. The Dropout Rate at Crane was 63%, while at Bogan, it was only 11%. These are major differences which need to be explored. This study provides some insight into the differences among high schools in Chicago, and differences which exist among the students who enroll at the various high schools.

For the purposes of this study, students were tracked from the time they entered a particular school until they left the Chicago public high schools. Their outcomes are recorded against the school in which they originally enrolled. About 85% of the students attend only one school during their Chicago high school career. The other 15% transfer at least once, from one Chicago school to another. Since this study tracked point of entry and point of departure, but not all changes in between, some students may have transferred multiple times; data are not available to measure this movement within the system, except for changes in point of departure. Since so many depart from the school where they entered, it seems a good way to report Dropout and Graduation Rates. It does, however, mean that Jones Commercial High School, which receives only Junior and Seniors, is not included in most of this data (see on, page 8, and Table 8). The students who transferred to Jones are recorded against the schools where they originally enrolled.

The following table presents the basic data about each of the 63 high schools in which the Class of 1982 enrolled in September 1978. There are a number of specialized schools which serve a small sector of high school level students. These schools are discussed later in this section. However, for most of this section, 63 schools (excluding Jones) form the basic complement. One school, Harrison, has since been closed, with its students transferred, primarily to Farragut. The building is currently being utilized as an elementary magnet school. In the next few pages, these 63 schools will be examined for student outcomes, and the characteristics of the students who enrolled at each will be analyzed.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — HIGH SCHOOLS RANKED BY DROPOUT RATE — TABLE 2

School Level Data - Class of 1982

SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	NUMBER TRANSFERS	TRANSFER RATE	CONTINUING STUDENTS w/o ACTIVES	DROPOUTS	DROPOUT RATE
1	1270	Crane	9	Gen	628	37	5.9%	583	365	62.6%
2	1220	Austin	7	Gen	882	49	5.6%	829	515	62.1%
3	1050	Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	87	9	10.3%	77	46	59.7%
4	1280	DuSable	13	Gen	632	26	4.1%	602	352	58.5%
5	1510	Phillips	11	Gen	858	43	5.0%	806	463	57.4%
6	1320	Robeson	16	Gen	658	103	15.7%	551	316	57.4%
7	1470	Marshall	9	Gen	546	25	4.6%	518	297	57.3%
8	1310	Fenger	20	Gen	558	64	11.5%	494	278	56.3%
9	1840	Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	123	11.5%	935	525	56.1%
10	1640	Wells	6	Gen	569	86	15.1%	482	268	55.6%
11	1300	Farragut	10	Gen	569	36	6.3%	528	292	55.3%
12	1020	Cregier Voc	9	Voc	217	8	3.7%	208	114	54.8%
13	1360	Harper	15	Gen	457	37	8.1%	418	224	53.6%
14	1680	Englewood	16	Gen	594	37	6.2%	548	293	53.5%
15	1250	Calumet	16	Gen	752	77	10.2%	672	359	53.4%
16	1550	South Shore	17	Gen	723	54	7.5%	666	355	53.3%
17	1460	Manley	8	Gen	573	27	4.7%	541	288	53.2%
18	1400	Kelly	8	Gen	416	43	10.3%	369	194	52.6%
19	1430	Lakeview	3	Gen	452	71	15.7%	380	198	52.1%
20	1590	Tilden	13	Gen	563	50	8.9%	510	264	51.8%
21	1890	Juarez	8	Gen	508	70	13.8%	434	221	50.9%
22	1520	Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	60	13.8%	375	189	50.4%
23	1760	King,M.L.	14	Gen	454	25	5.5%	428	215	50.2%
24	1620	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	32	11.7%	241	119	49.4%
25	1340	Gage Park	12	Gen	503	37	7.4%	466	228	48.9%
26	1530	Schurz	4	Gen	940	119	12.7%	818	400	48.9%
27	1850	Carver	20	Gen	616	32	5.2%	581	281	48.4%
28	1880	Collins	8	Gen	440	20	4.5%	420	202	48.1%
29	1830	Orr	5	Gen	589	65	11.0%	521	250	48.0%
30	1240	Bowen	19	Gen	773	61	7.9%	709	338	47.7%
31	1370	Harrison +	8	Gen	322	48	14.9%	273	129	47.3%
32	1380	Hirsh	17	Gen	359	31	8.6%	328	150	45.7%
33	1210	Amundsen	2	Gen	398	58	14.6%	339	155	45.7%
34	1410	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	347	53	15.3%	293	130	44.4%
35	1350	Harlan	19	Gen	696	47	6.8%	645	281	43.6%
36	1040	Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	11	5.5%	188	80	42.6%
37	1540	Senn	2	Gen	597	82	13.7%	514	218	42.4%
38	1670	Hubbard	15	Gen	341	39	11.4%	302	122	40.4%
39	1800	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	3	6.3%	45	18	40.0%
40	1390	Hyde Park	14	Gen	724	42	5.8%	680	256	37.6%
41	1330	Foreman	4	Gen	311	61	19.6%	250	94	37.6%
42	1560	Steinmetz	4	Gen	528	54	10.3%	469	164	35.0%
43	1570	Sullivan	2	Gen	325	70	21.5%	255	89	34.9%
44	1150	Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	32	6.6%	452	154	34.1%
45	1860	Corliss	20	Gen	621	69	11.1%	545	183	33.6%
46	1110	Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	14	7.7%	168	56	33.3%
47	1870	Julian	18	Gen	573	39	6.8%	533	173	32.5%
48	1610	Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	59	17.1%	286	88	30.8%
49	1420	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	24	6.5%	346	102	29.5%
50	1820	Curie	12	Gen	735	66	9.0%	665	193	29.0%
51	1030	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	41	6.7%	567	159	28.0%
52	1010	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	67	6.5%	962	261	27.1%
53	1490	Morgan Park	18	Gen	469	31	6.6%	436	118	27.1%
54	1630	Washington	20	Gen	369	29	7.9%	340	80	23.5%
55	1070	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	37	9.6%	349	80	22.9%
56	1160	Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	433	15	3.5%	416	92	22.1%
57	1450	Lindblom	15	Tech	616	64	10.4%	550	121	22.0%
58	1480	Mather	2	Gen	382	39	10.2%	343	75	21.9%
59	1710	Kenwood	14	Gen	516	77	14.9%	438	85	19.4%
60	1810	Young	9	Gen	559	57	10.2%	500	95	19.0%
61	1580	Taft	1	Gen	509	31	6.1%	477	87	18.2%
62	1440	Lane	3	Tech	882	83	9.4%	799	127	15.9%
63	1230	Bogan	15	Gen	300	23	7.7%	277	30	10.8%
		SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,142	3,060	9.2%	29,942	12,804	42.8%
		TOP THIRD TOTALS			12,309	1,075	8.7%	11,151	6,227	55.8%
		MID THIRD TOTALS			9,891	980	9.9%	8,885	4,019	45.2%
		LOW THIRD TOTALS			10,783	993	9.2%	9,762	2,464	25.2%
		SPECIAL SCHOOLS TOTALS			159	12	7.5%	144	94	65.3%

A. THE 21 SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST DROPOUT RATES

The third of all schools with the highest Dropout Rates account for nearly half (49%) of all Dropouts from the system. All of these schools had more than half of their continuing students dropout. Crane had the highest Dropout Rate in the system for the Class of 1982 at 63%, followed closely by Austin at 62% (see Table 3). In the aggregate, 56% of the students who entered these 21 school dropped out! That means only 44% graduated. Two of these schools were Vocational schools: Cregier (Dropout Rate:55%) and New North Career Magnet (60%); however, it must be noted that for the Class of 1982, Near North was known as Cooley, and now runs a completely different kind of program, attracting a different group of students. The other 19 schools were general high schools, primarily enrolling students from their immediate neighborhood.

The eight schools with the highest Dropout Rates were all more than 99% Black. Sixteen of these 21 schools were majority Black; three were majority Hispanic; one was mixed Hispanic and White (Lakeview); and one was majority White (Kelly). Of the students entering these 21 schools, 76% were Black, 18% were Hispanic, and only 6% were White. The Whites were primarily located in two schools, Kelly and Lakeview, with a few in Wells, Tilden, and Juarez.

A third of the students entering these schools were overage. Only 30% entered with recorded scores at or above normal reading levels. That means that more than two-thirds of the students entering these schools were reading more than two years behind grade level or were missing scores. Only at Juarez (35%), Kelly (23%), Wells (19%), Lakeview (17%), and Clemente (15%), all with large Hispanic enrollments, did significant numbers of students have no recorded test scores. Thus, these schools receive a disproportionate share of the students most likely to become Dropouts: overage Blacks and Hispanics with below normal reading scores.

Still, some of these schools do remarkably well, considering the needs of the students they enrolled.

- -Juarez graduated 49%, though only 25% of its entering students read at or above normal levels; 40% enter reading two years behind grade level and 35% had no recorded test scores; nearly half (47%) of Juarez' entering freshmen were overage (the second highest percent in the system, behind Robeson).
- -Tilden graduated 48%, though only 25% of its students read at normal levels, and a third (32%) of its entrants were overage.
- -Manley graduated 47% though receiving 80% below normal readers and 36% overage.
- -Harper graduated 46% with statistics like Manley's (79% below normal and 35% overage).

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

HIGH SCHOOLS RANKED BY DROPOUT RATE
The Worst 21 Schools

TABLE 3

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED ORIG SCH	PERCENT w/ NORMAL SCORES
1	1270	Crane	9	Gen	628	62.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.6%	82.0%	40.3%
2	1220	Austin	7	Gen	882	62.1%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	27.4%	69.5%	18.4%
3	1050	Near No. Career Mag	3	Voc	87	59.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.4%	78.2%	27.6%
4	1280	DuSable	13	Gen	632	58.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	89.2%	27.7%
5	1510	Phillips	11	Gen	858	57.4%	0.1%	99.5%	0.0%	0.3%	38.2%	85.5%	23.5%
6	1320	Robeson	16	Gen	658	57.4%	0.3%	99.5%	0.0%	0.0%	50.2%	84.5%	44.1%
7	1470	Marshall	9	Gen	546	57.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.0%	36.6%	77.7%	22.2%
8	1310	Fenger	20	Gen	558	56.3%	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.7%	29.7%	86.2%	26.9%
9	1840	Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	56.1%	7.3%	10.8%	0.6%	81.1%	30.6%	88.9%	26.3%
10	1640	Wells	6	Gen	569	55.6%	12.1%	25.8%	0.0%	61.7%	34.9%	84.5%	30.8%
11	1300	Farragut	10	Gen	569	55.3%	0.9%	76.4%	0.2%	22.5%	32.4%	79.3%	30.2%
12	1020	Cregier Voc	9	Voc	217	54.8%	0.9%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	40.3%	63.6%	32.7%
13	1360	Harper	15	Gen	457	53.6%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	35.2%	74.8%	21.2%
14	1680	Englewood	16	Gen	594	53.5%	0.0%	99.0%	0.0%	0.2%	40.2%	83.0%	34.8%
15	1250	Calumet	16	Gen	752	53.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	80.6%	36.3%
16	1550	South Shore	17	Gen	723	53.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.1%	23.9%	83.8%	38.0%
17	1460	Manley	8	Gen	573	53.2%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	36.4%	80.3%	19.7%
18	1400	Kelly	8	Gen	416	52.6%	73.1%	0.0%	1.0%	26.0%	22.4%	94.2%	49.8%
19	1430	Lakeview	3	Gen	452	52.1%	40.3%	11.1%	6.0%	41.2%	26.4%	83.6%	43.6%
20	1590	Tilden	13	Gen	563	51.8%	10.1%	75.7%	0.2%	13.9%	31.7%	86.0%	24.6%
21	1890	Juarez	8	Gen	508	50.9%	4.7%	1.8%	0.0%	92.1%	46.8%	93.3%	25.0%
		TOP THIRD TOTALS			12,309	55.8%	5.9%	75.7%	0.3%	17.8%	34.5%	82.9%	30.1%
		SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,142	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%

Some schools do worse than might be expected. Crane had the worst Dropout Rate (63%) though they received a higher proportion of students reading at or above normal levels than all but three of these 21 schools. Robeson, Kelly, and Lakeview all received more than 40% of their students reading at normal levels. Austin also performed poorly, considering the proportion of entering students who were 14 years old.

Transfer Rates for these schools with the worst Dropout Rates were about average, except for Robeson (16%), and the heavily Hispanic schools: Lakeview (15%), Wells (15%), Juarez (13%), and Clemente (12%).

B. THE 21 SCHOOLS WITH THE LOWEST DROPOUT RATES

Each of the 21 best schools graduated more than 65% of their students, with 10 schools above the national norm (73% according to Department of Education figures) and 5 (Bogan, Lane, Taft, Young, and Kenwood) graduated more than 80% of their continuing students. At the top three schools (Bogan, Lane, and Taft), more than 90% of the entering students completed their high school career (graduated or dropped out) at the school in which they originally enrolled. Thus, these schools enjoyed great stability among their student body.

In the aggregate, the Transfer Rate for these schools was about average, but a few schools had significantly higher rates: Sullivan (21.5%), from which more than one out of five entering freshmen transferred out of the system, had the highest rate of any Chicago high school. Sullivan's student body dramatically increased the proportion of Black and Hispanic students during the four years the Class of 1982 was in school; Whites decreased proportionately. Von Steuben also had a high Transfer Rate (17.1%), but did not experience the same degree of racial change.

The entering classes at two of the top three schools were more than 90% White (Bogan and Taft), and six others were majority White. Thus, half (8) of the system's schools with a majority White entering class were among the 21 schools with the best graduating rates. Seven of these 21 schools were all Black, three others were majority Black. Three schools (Von Steuben, Richards Vocational, and Sullivan) were racially mixed. Over half of all White and all Hispanic freshmen enrolled in these schools, while less than 30% of Blacks did so.

PERCENT OF RACE ENROLLED

	White	Black	Asian	Hispanic
21 Lowest Rate Schools	51%	29%	27%	51%
21 Mid-Range Schools	39%	25%	42%	43%
21 Highest Rate Schools	10%	45%	27%	6%
	100%	100%	100%	100%

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

HIGH SCHOOLS RANKED BY DROPOUT RATE
The 21 Schools with the Lowest Rates

TABLE 4

RANK	UNIT #SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED ORIG SCH	PERCENT ✓ NORMAL SCORES
1	1230 Bogan	15	Gen	300	10.8%	95.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	19.3%	96.7%	82.7%
2	1440 Lane	3	Tech	882	15.9%	64.9%	12.1%	11.9%	10.8%	2.7%	90.2%	96.6%
3	1580 Taft	1	Gen	509	18.2%	91.0%	6.7%	0.6%	1.8%	8.5%	95.9%	79.0%
4	1810 Young	9	Gen	559	19.0%	27.5%	52.3%	5.5%	12.2%	7.9%	83.4%	63.1%
5	1710 Kenwood	14	Gen	516	19.4%	17.8%	72.9%	2.7%	1.6%	9.5%	80.4%	70.3%
6	1480 Mather	2	Gen	382	21.9%	74.3%	10.2%	11.5%	2.9%	14.9%	93.2%	71.2%
7	1450 Lindblom	15	Tech	616	22.0%	0.2%	95.8%	3.7%	0.3%	4.5%	82.1%	81.3%
8	1160 Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	433	22.1%	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	82.7%	85.0%
9	1070 Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	22.9%	54.7%	22.0%	1.3%	21.2%	8.3%	88.1%	72.8%
10	1630 Washington	20	Gen	369	23.5%	83.5%	0.3%	0.8%	13.8%	19.0%	97.8%	71.0%
11	1490 Morgan Park	18	Gen	469	27.1%	35.4%	63.1%	0.2%	0.6%	27.6%	92.5%	60.8%
12	1010 Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	27.1%	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.5%	9.5%	87.4%	85.3%
13	1030 Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	28.0%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	11.3%	89.1%	82.9%
14	1820 Curie	12	Gen	735	29.0%	57.3%	25.7%	1.1%	15.4%	15.6%	91.0%	57.1%
15	1420 Kennedy	12	Gen	370	29.5%	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	2.2%	16.8%	91.9%	69.5%
16	1610 Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	30.8%	46.5%	22.8%	12.7%	17.3%	22.3%	91.6%	52.6%
17	1870 Julian	18	Gen	573	32.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	17.5%	89.2%	56.5%
18	1110 Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	33.3%	26.4%	23.6%	0.0%	46.2%	19.8%	74.2%	56.0%
19	1860 Corliss	20	Gen	621	33.6%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	86.6%	55.7%
20	1150 Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	34.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	86.0%	75.8%
21	1570 Sullivan	2	Gen	325	34.9%	43.7%	32.0%	9.5%	12.6%	22.5%	84.0%	48.0%
	TOP THIRD TOTALS			10,696	25.2%	33.5%	56.7%	2.9%	6.1%	13.3%	88.4%	72.2%
	SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,142	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%

Only 13% of the students enrolling at these schools were overage. Only one school, Morgan Park (28%), had more than a quarter overage. Seventy-two percent were reading at or above normal levels. Thus, most of these schools are doing well, at least in part because they are getting the best students (e.g., Lane, ranked #2, had 97% of its students reading at or above normal levels; the rest were missing test scores). Among the top ten schools, only Young had fewer than 70% entering with normal or higher reading scores, and Young had 31% without recorded scores. Still, some of these schools did well even though receiving less well prepared students. Some had more than 40% with low or missing scores, but graduated about two-thirds of their students (Sullivan - 52%, Von Steuben - 47%, Corliss - 44%, Richards Vocational - 44%, Julian - 44%, and Curie - 43%). Morgan Park had 39% at this low/missing level and 28% overage and still graduated 73% (the national norm).

Some schools do not do as well as might be expected: Simeon received 76% of its entering class reading at normal or higher levels, but graduated only 66% of its entering class. Similarly, Chicago Vocational (CVS) and Dunbar Vocational received 85% and 83% reading at normal levels, but graduated only 73% and 72% respectively. Westinghouse Vocational also received 85% reading at normal rates and graduated 78%. Clearly, when compared with other schools in the system, these schools are not doing poorly, but given the high level of preparation of students enrolling at these schools, something more could be expected of them.

C. THE MID-RANGE SCHOOLS

In the mid-range schools, between half and two thirds of the students graduate. Transfer rates are about equal to systemwide rates except in the more heavily Hispanic schools (Kelvyn Park and Harrison) and Foreman (at 19.6%, the second highest transfer rate in the system). Foreman's entering class was 85.5% White, but by 1982 the school population was less than 50% White, thus the school experienced rapid racial change while the Class of 1982 was enrolled.

Seven of these schools had all Black entering classes, and five others were majority Black; four were three quarters White and two majority White; two were majority Hispanic; and one (Senn) was mixed. In the aggregate, students entering these schools were slightly disproportionately White (28% vs. 21.5% systemwide); a majority (53%) were Black; 16% were Hispanic; and 3% were Asian.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

HIGH SCHOOLS RANKED BY DROPOUT RATE
The 21 Mid-Range Schools

TABLE 5

RANK	UNIT #SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED ORIG SCH	PERCENT w/ NORMAL SCORES
22	1520 Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	50.4%	67.8%	6.4%	9.2%	15.4%	20.9%	89.0%	52.2%
23	1760 King,M.L.	14	Gen	454	50.2%	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	34.0%	83.5%	28.0%
24	1620 Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	49.4%	8.8%	65.7%	0.7%	23.0%	28.9%	73.0%	36.5%
25	1340 Gage Park	12	Gen	503	48.9%	38.9%	52.3%	0.8%	8.0%	18.3%	86.3%	40.8%
26	1530 Schurz	4	Gen	940	48.9%	61.3%	3.7%	2.7%	30.6%	23.8%	90.3%	51.6%
27	1850 Carver	20	Gen	616	48.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	83.6%	45.1%
28	1880 Collins	8	Gen	440	48.1%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	79.8%	26.1%
29	1830 Orr	5	Gen	589	48.0%	3.1%	69.1%	0.8%	25.5%	30.5%	74.9%	21.7%
30	1240 Bowen	19	Gen	773	47.7%	1.7%	58.7%	0.1%	38.7%	32.5%	87.8%	30.9%
31	1370 Harrison +	8	Gen	322	47.3%	4.7%	37.3%	0.3%	57.1%	36.1%	81.1%	30.7%
32	1380 Hirsh	17	Gen	359	45.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.4%	77.7%	37.3%
33	1210 Amundsen	2	Gen	398	45.7%	74.9%	4.0%	7.5%	10.6%	26.4%	89.7%	43.2%
34	1410 Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	347	44.4%	34.0%	1.2%	1.7%	62.8%	30.3%	88.2%	39.2%
35	1350 Harlan	19	Gen	696	43.6%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	26.3%	85.2%	38.4%
36	1040 Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	42.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%	69.0%	38.0%
37	1540 Senn	2	Gen	597	42.4%	36.0%	19.6%	21.7%	21.7%	32.7%	84.1%	29.8%
38	1670 Hubbard	15	Gen	341	40.4%	85.3%	2.3%	1.2%	9.7%	22.6%	93.5%	68.0%
39	1800 Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	40.0%	25.0%	64.6%	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%	87.5%	91.7%
40	1390 Hyde Park	14	Gen	728	37.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	84.7%	57.7%
41	1330 Foreman	4	Gen	311	37.6%	85.5%	1.0%	0.6%	12.2%	22.5%	92.3%	56.9%
42	1560 Steinmetz	4	Gen	528	35.0%	76.1%	15.1%	4.0%	4.0%	18.5%	94.1%	57.4%
	MID THIRD TOTALS			9,891	45.2%	27.7%	52.9%	2.7%	15.9%	26.7%	85.2%	41.8%
	SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,142	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%

A quarter (the systemwide average) of the entering students in these schools were overage, with a few schools showing more than a third overage (Harrison, Hirsch, King, and Collins). Of these students, 58% were reading more than two years below normal or had no recorded test scores. Schools with over 60% Graduation Rates, in this range (Hubbard, Metro, Hyde Park, Foreman, and Steinmetz), all had significantly more students with normal test scores.

Again, some schools do better than others. 78% of Orr's entering students were at least two years behind in reading, but 52% graduated (compared with Carver which also graduated about 52% but only had 55% so far behind at entrance). Similarly, Collins received 74% with below normal or missing scores and graduated 52%, and Senn received 70% below or missing scores and graduated 58%. On the other hand, only 8% of Metro's students did not have normal reading scores, but 40% dropped out.

D. TRANSFER RATES

In addition to Dropout and Graduation Rates, the Panel tracked students transferring out of the system. Systemwide, 9% of all entering students transferred out of the Chicago Public Schools to other accredited degree granting high schools. A larger number of students were recorded as transferring, but a manual examination of the files of all transferring students revealed improper destinations which were reclassified as Dropouts.

Hispanics and Whites were more likely to transfer out of the system than were Blacks. Transfers were more frequent out of schools whose entering class was heavily White or Hispanic. Only 4% of entering Whites and 1% of Hispanics attended the 21 schools with the lowest Transfer Rates. Fourty percent of all Whites and 62% of Hispanics were in schools with the highest rates.

Only 4 of the 21 schools with the highest Transfer Rates were all Black, with three others a majority Black. Four of these majority Black schools had high Dropout Rates, but three were among the schools with the highest Graduation Rates. Five schools were majority White in the entering class, and five were majority Hispanic. Four were racially mixed.

Five of the schools with the highest Transfer Rates were among the top third for Graduation Rates, six were among the 21 worst schools, and ten were in the mid-range. Generally, these high transfer schools received less than half of their students with reading scores at or above normal. Lindbloom (81%), Kenwood (70%), and Hubbard (68%) were the exceptions to this general picture.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — HIGH SCHOOLS RANKED BY TRANSFER RATE — TABLE 6

School Level Data - Class of 1982

SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

RANK	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	NUMBER TRANSFERS	TRANSFER RATE	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED w/ ORIG SCH	PERCENT NORMAL SCORES
1	Sullivan	2	Gen	325	70	21.5%	34.9%	43.7%	32.0%	9.5%	12.6%	22.5%	84.0%	48.0%
2	Foreman	4	Gen	311	61	19.6%	37.6%	85.5%	1.0%	0.6%	12.2%	22.5%	92.3%	56.9%
3	Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	59	17.1%	30.8%	46.5%	22.8%	12.7%	17.3%	22.3%	91.6%	52.6%
4	Lakeview	3	Gen	452	71	15.7%	52.1%	40.3%	11.1%	6.0%	41.2%	26.4%	83.6%	43.6%
5	Robeson	16	Gen	658	103	15.7%	57.4%	0.3%	99.5%	0.0%	0.0%	50.2%	84.5%	44.1%
6	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	347	53	15.3%	44.4%	34.0%	1.2%	1.7%	62.8%	30.3%	88.2%	39.2%
7	Wells	6	Gen	569	86	15.1%	55.6%	12.1%	25.8%	0.0%	61.7%	34.9%	84.5%	30.8%
8	Kenwood	14	Gen	516	77	14.9%	19.4%	17.8%	72.9%	2.7%	1.6%	9.5%	80.4%	70.3%
9	Harrison +	8	Gen	322	48	14.9%	47.3%	4.7%	37.3%	0.3%	57.1%	36.1%	81.1%	30.7%
10	Amundsen	2	Gen	398	58	14.6%	45.7%	74.9%	4.0%	7.5%	10.6%	26.4%	89.7%	43.2%
11	Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	60	13.8%	50.4%	67.8%	6.4%	9.2%	15.4%	20.5%	89.0%	52.2%
12	Juarez	8	Gen	508	70	13.8%	50.9%	4.7%	1.8%	0.0%	92.1%	46.8%	93.3%	25.0%
13	Senn	2	Gen	597	82	13.7%	42.4%	36.0%	19.6%	21.7%	21.7%	32.7%	84.1%	29.8%
14	Schurz	4	Gen	940	119	12.7%	48.9%	61.3%	3.7%	2.7%	30.0%	23.8%	90.3%	51.6%
15	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	32	11.7%	49.4%	8.8%	65.7%	0.7%	23.0%	28.9%	73.0%	36.5%
16	Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	123	11.5%	56.1%	7.3%	10.8%	0.6%	81.1%	30.6%	88.9%	26.3%
17	Fenger	20	Gen	558	64	11.5%	56.3%	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.7%	29.7%	86.2%	26.9%
18	Hubbard	15	Gen	341	39	11.4%	40.4%	86.3%	2.9%	1.2%	9.7%	22.6%	93.5%	68.0%
19	Corliss	20	Gen	621	69	11.1%	33.6%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	86.6%	55.7%
20	Orr	5	Gen	589	65	11.0%	48.0%	3.1%	69.1%	0.8%	25.5%	30.5%	74.9%	21.7%
21	Lindblom	15	Tech	616	64	10.4%	22.0%	0.2%	95.8%	3.7%	0.3%	4.9%	82.1%	81.3%
22	Near No. Career	3	Voc	87	9	10.3%	59.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.4%	78.2%	27.6%
23	Kelly	8	Gen	416	43	10.3%	52.6%	73.1%	0.0%	1.0%	26.0%	22.4%	94.2%	49.8%
24	Steinmetz	4	Gen	524	54	10.3%	35.0%	76.1%	15.1%	4.0%	4.0%	18.5%	94.1%	57.4%
25	Calumet	16	Gen	752	77	10.2%	53.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	80.6%	36.3%
26	Mather	2	Gen	382	39	10.2%	21.9%	74.3%	10.2%	11.5%	2.9%	14.9%	93.2%	71.1%
27	Young	9	Gen	559	57	10.2%	19.0%	27.5%	52.2%	5.5%	12.2%	7.9%	83.4%	63.1%
28	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	37	9.6%	22.9%	54.7%	22.0%	1.3%	21.2%	8.3%	88.1%	72.8%
29	Lane	3	Tech	882	83	9.4%	15.9%	84.9%	12.1%	11.9%	10.8%	2.7%	90.2%	96.6%
30	Curie	12	Gen	735	66	9.0%	29.0%	57.3%	25.7%	1.1%	15.4%	15.6%	91.0%	57.1%
31	Tilden	13	Gen	563	50	8.9%	51.8%	10.1%	75.7%	0.2%	13.9%	31.7%	86.0%	24.6%
32	Hirsh	17	Gen	359	31	8.6%	45.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.4%	77.7%	37.3%
33	Harper	15	Gen	457	37	8.1%	53.6%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	35.2%	74.8%	21.2%
34	Powen	19	Gen	773	61	7.9%	47.7%	1.7%	58.7%	0.1%	38.7%	32.5%	87.8%	30.9%
35	Washington	20	Gen	369	29	7.9%	23.5%	83.5%	0.3%	0.8%	13.8%	19.8%	97.8%	71.0%
36	Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	14	7.7%	33.3%	26.4%	23.6%	0.0%	46.2%	19.8%	74.2%	56.0%
37	Bogan	15	Gen	300	23	7.7%	10.8%	95.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	19.3%	96.7%	82.7%
38	South Shore	17	Gen	723	54	7.5%	53.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.1%	23.9%	83.8%	38.0%
39	Gage Park	12	Gen	503	37	7.4%	48.9%	38.9%	52.3%	0.8%	8.0%	18.3%	86.3%	40.8%
40	Julian	18	Gen	573	39	6.8%	32.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	17.5%	89.2%	56.5%
41	Harlan	19	Gen	696	47	6.8%	43.6%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	26.3%	85.2%	38.4%
42	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	41	6.7%	28.0%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	11.3%	89.1%	82.9%
43	Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	32	6.6%	34.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	86.0%	75.8%
44	Morgan Park	18	Gen	469	31	6.6%	27.1%	35.4%	63.1%	0.2%	0.6%	27.6%	92.5%	60.8%
45	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	67	6.5%	27.1%	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.5%	9.5%	87.4%	85.3%
46	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	24	6.5%	29.5%	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	2.2%	16.8%	91.9%	69.5%
47	Farragut	10	Gen	569	36	6.3%	55.3%	0.9%	76.4%	0.2%	22.5%	32.4%	79.3%	30.2%
48	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	3	6.3%	40.0%	25.0%	64.6%	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%	87.5%	91.7%
49	Englewood	16	Gen	594	37	6.2%	53.5%	0.0%	99.0%	0.0%	0.2%	40.2%	83.0%	34.8%
50	Taft	1	Gen	509	31	6.1%	18.2%	91.0%	6.7%	0.6%	1.8%	8.5%	95.9%	79.0%
51	Crane	9	Gen	628	37	5.9%	62.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.6%	82.0%	40.3%
52	Hyde Park	14	Gen	724	42	5.8%	37.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	84.7%	57.7%
53	Austin	7	Gen	882	49	5.6%	62.1%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	27.4%	69.5%	18.4%
54	King, M.L.	14	Gen	454	25	5.5%	50.2%	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	34.0%	83.5%	28.0%
55	Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	11	5.5%	42.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%	69.0%	38.0%
56	Carver	20	Gen	616	32	5.2%	48.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	83.6%	45.1%
57	Phillips	17	Gen	858	43	5.0%	57.4%	0.1%	99.5%	0.0%	0.3%	38.2%	85.5%	23.5%
58	Manley	8	Gen	573	27	4.7%	53.2%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	36.4%	80.3%	19.7%
59	Marshall	9	Gen	546	25	4.6%	57.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.0%	36.6%	77.7%	22.2%
60	Collins	8	Gen	440	20	4.5%	48.1%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	79.8%	26.1%
61	DuSable	13	Gen	632	26	4.1%	58.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	89.2%	27.7%
62	Oregier Voc	9	Voc	217	8	3.7%	54.8%	0.9%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	40.3%	63.6%	32.7%
63	Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	433	15	3.5%	22.1%	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	82.7%	85.0%
	SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,142	3,060	9.2%	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%
	TOP THIRD TOTALS			10,790	1,473	13.7%	45.0%	26.6%	39.1%	3.6%	29.6%	27.3%	86.0%	43.6%
	MID THIRD TOTALS			10,829	928	8.6%	37.2%	30.0%	57.5%	2.1%	9.8%	21.0%	87.2%	53.4%
	LOW THIRD TOTALS			11,364	647	5.7%	45.6%	8.5%	89.9%	.0%	1.5%	27.4%	82.9%	45.0%
	SPECIAL SCHOOLS TOTALS			159	12	7.5%	65.3%	6.9%	61.0%	0.0%	30.2%	71.8%	22.6%	3.8%

	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC
Top Third	40.4%	20.3%	66.7%	62.4%
Mid Third	45.8%	30.0%	28.2%	36.8%
Low Third	13.6%	49.2%	6.1%	0.8%
Spec. Sch.	0.2%	0.5%	3.0%	0.0%

The schools with the lowest rates of transfers out of the system were overwhelmingly Black. The 13 schools with the fewest transfers out of the Chicago system (all less than 5%) were all more than 99% Black. Only Taft and Kennedy, among the third of the schools with the fewest transfers, were predominately White. None was more than 23% Hispanic (Farragut), and only one other had more than 2% Hispanic (Chicago Metro - 8.3%). Of the students attending the schools with fewest transfers, 90% were Black. 49% of all Black students attended these low transfer schools, while less than 1% of all Hispanics did. Thus, for half of all entering Blacks, options outside the Chicago system virtually do not exist, or at least, are not perceived to be available.

E. TRANSFERS WITHIN CHICAGO SYSTEM

Three-fourths of all entering students in the Class of '82 finished their high school careers at the school where they enrolled. 9% transferred out of the Chicago Public Schools to other accredited high schools. 15% transferred from the school in which they began high school to another Chicago public high school. However, as we have seen when examining the Transfer Rate (9% systemwide), schools vary significantly. At Taft, 90% of entering students also completed their careers there, while at Cregier Vocational, only 61% did. Only 4% of Taft's entering students transferred to another Chicago high school, while 36% of Cregier's students did so. Interestingly, both Taft and Cregier had few students transferring out of the system (6% and 4% respectively).

The Dropout Rate for schools where most students stay at the school in which they originally enrolled is significantly lower than for less stable schools (32% vs. 46% and 45% for the middle and lower thirds). However, some of the schools with the highest Dropout Rates are included in the most stable schools: DuSable (59% Dropouts), Phillips (58%), Kelly (52%), and Bowen (48%). Ten of the 16 most stable schools are predominately White. Thus, a pattern appears in which schools with high numbers of Whites and minority schools with the worst Dropout Rates are the most stable. It would appear that Whites in the Class of 1982 perceived they had few transfer options, and minorities in the worst schools likewise perceived few transfer options. Stability of residence was also likely to be a factor, but these data do not include that factor.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

TABLE 7

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	PERCENT ORIG UNIT COMPLETED ORIG UNIT	ORIG UNIT GRAD RATE	ORIG UNIT DROPOUT RATE	ORIG UNIT TRANSFER RATE	PERCENT TRANSF TO CHI PUB HS	TRANSF TO CHI PUB HS GRAD RATE	TRANSF TO CHI PUB HS DROP RATE	TRANSF TO CHI PUB HS TRANS RATE
1	1580	Taft	1	Gen	509	90.0%	83.8%	16.2%	6.1%	4.1%	31.6%	68.4%	5.0%
2	1630	Washington	20	Gen	369	90.0%	77.4%	22.6%	8.0%	2.2%	37.5%	62.5%	0.0%
3	1230	Bogan	15	Gen	300	89.3%	91.0%	9.0%	7.6%	3.3%	33.3%	66.7%	10.0%
4	1490	Morgan Park	18	Gen	469	86.1%	76.0%	24.0%	6.9%	7.5%	34.4%	65.6%	3.0%
5	1420	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	85.7%	72.2%	27.8%	6.8%	8.1%	51.7%	48.3%	3.3%
6	1280	DuSable	13	Gen	632	85.1%	41.3%	58.7%	4.3%	10.8%	43.8%	56.3%	3.0%
7	1400	Kelly	8	Gen	416	84.9%	47.9%	52.1%	9.9%	5.8%	37.5%	62.5%	20.0%
8	1800	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	46	84.8%	64.1%	35.9%	7.1%	8.7%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%
9	1560	Steinmetz	4	Gen	528	83.8%	66.7%	33.3%	11.0%	5.9%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%
10	1870	Julian	18	Gen	573	83.4%	70.3%	29.7%	6.5%	10.8%	43.6%	56.4%	9.8%
11	1670	Hubbard	15	Gen	341	83.3%	60.2%	39.8%	11.0%	6.5%	50.0%	50.0%	18.2%
12	1480	Mather	2	Gen	382	83.2%	79.9%	20.1%	10.7%	6.8%	56.0%	44.0%	3.8%
13	1030	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	82.6%	73.5%	26.5%	7.4%	10.9%	60.0%	40.0%	1.5%
14	1820	Curie	12	Gen	735	82.2%	74.8%	25.2%	9.4%	9.0%	32.8%	67.2%	4.7%
15	1010	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	81.7%	75.5%	24.5%	6.5%	12.6%	54.2%	45.8%	6.3%
16	1440	Lane	3	Tech	882	81.2%	87.3%	12.7%	10.1%	9.8%	56.6%	43.4%	3.5%
17	1240	Bowen	19	Gen	773	80.1%	54.3%	45.7%	8.6%	12.2%	38.9%	61.1%	3.2%
18	1510	Phillips	11	Gen	858	80.1%	41.8%	58.2%	5.6%	14.5%	47.1%	52.9%	1.7%
19	1070	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	79.8%	78.2%	21.8%	9.4%	11.9%	68.3%	31.7%	10.9%
20	1150	Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	79.8%	70.5%	29.5%	7.2%	14.0%	39.4%	60.6%	2.9%
21	1390	Hyde Park	14	Gen	724	79.7%	65.3%	34.7%	5.9%	15.3%	45.6%	54.4%	5.5%
22	1160	Westinghouse Vo	7	Voc	433	79.4%	82.6%	17.4%	3.6%	17.3%	55.6%	44.4%	2.7%
23	1850	Carver	20	Gen	616	79.4%	52.1%	47.9%	4.9%	16.4%	48.9%	51.1%	7.1%
24	1340	Gage Park	12	Gen	503	79.3%	51.9%	48.1%	8.1%	13.7%	46.3%	53.7%	2.9%
25	1890	Juarez	8	Gen	508	79.1%	50.0%	50.0%	14.6%	6.7%	37.5%	62.5%	3.0%
26	1350	Harlan	19	Gen	696	79.0%	58.4%	41.6%	7.3%	14.8%	45.3%	54.7%	4.0%
27	1760	King, M.L.	14	Gen	454	78.4%	50.6%	49.4%	5.8%	16.5%	45.8%	54.2%	4.0%
28	1530	Schurz	4	Gen	940	78.3%	52.2%	47.8%	13.2%	9.7%	41.5%	58.5%	7.9%
29	1840	Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	77.3%	46.4%	53.6%	12.4%	11.1%	24.5%	75.5%	5.2%
30	1550	South Shore	17	Gen	723	77.3%	47.8%	52.2%	7.8%	16.2%	41.1%	58.9%	6.1%
31	1590	Tilden	13	Gen	563	77.1%	49.1%	50.9%	10.1%	14.0%	43.4%	56.6%	1.3%
32	1210	Amundsen	2	Gen	398	76.4%	57.2%	42.8%	14.8%	10.3%	28.6%	71.4%	12.5%
33	1880	Collins	8	Gen	440	76.4%	55.7%	44.3%	4.3%	20.2%	36.9%	63.1%	5.6%
34	1270	Crane	9	Gen	628	76.3%	39.0%	61.0%	6.1%	18.0%	29.8%	70.2%	5.5%
35	1680	Englewood	16	Gen	594	76.3%	48.1%	51.9%	6.8%	17.0%	38.9%	61.1%	4.0%
36	1660	Corliss	20	Gen	621	76.0%	70.6%	29.4%	12.1%	13.4%	39.7%	60.3%	5.2%
37	1310	Fenger	20	Gen	558	76.0%	44.8%	55.2%	11.9%	13.8%	37.1%	62.9%	9.1%
38	1520	Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	75.9%	50.0%	50.0%	14.7%	11.0%	46.7%	53.3%	6.3%
39	1460	Hanley	8	Gen	573	75.7%	47.9%	52.1%	4.6%	19.7%	42.1%	57.9%	5.3%
40	1010	Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	75.1%	70.4%	29.6%	18.0%	8.4%	57.7%	42.3%	7.1%
41	1810	Young	9	Gen	559	74.2%	88.2%	11.8%	10.9%	16.6%	45.9%	54.1%	6.6%
42	1300	Farragut	10	Gen	569	73.8%	46.0%	54.0%	6.7%	20.7%	39.8%	60.2%	5.3%
43	1450	Lindblom	15	Tech	616	73.7%	83.0%	17.0%	10.5%	17.9%	54.2%	45.8%	11.1%
44	1410	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	347	73.5%	55.7%	44.3%	16.7%	11.8%	55.3%	44.7%	5.0%
45	1470	Marshall	9	Gen	546	73.4%	45.6%	54.4%	5.2%	22.3%	32.5%	67.5%	2.5%
46	1330	Foreman	4	Gen	311	72.7%	64.6%	35.4%	21.3%	7.7%	41.7%	58.3%	0.0%
47	1250	Calumet	16	Gen	752	71.8%	45.2%	54.8%	10.6%	19.4%	52.3%	47.7%	9.0%
48	1540	Senn	2	Gen	597	71.5%	58.8%	41.2%	14.9%	15.9%	51.7%	48.3%	7.4%
49	1640	Wells	6	Gen	569	70.5%	45.4%	54.6%	16.5%	15.5%	39.5%	60.5%	8.0%
50	1320	Robeson	16	Gen	658	70.1%	43.2%	56.8%	17.1%	15.5%	40.0%	60.0%	8.2%
51	1380	Hirsh	17	Gen	359	69.9%	56.6%	43.4%	10.0%	22.3%	46.8%	53.2%	3.8%
52	1430	Lakeview	3	Gen	452	69.5%	51.3%	48.7%	16.7%	16.4%	31.8%	68.2%	10.8%
53	1050	Near No. Career	3	Voc	87	69.0%	40.0%	60.0%	11.8%	21.8%	41.2%	58.8%	5.6%
54	1360	Harper	15	Gen	457	68.1%	49.2%	50.8%	9.1%	25.2%	38.3%	61.7%	5.3%
55	1370	Harrison +	8	Gen	322	67.4%	55.3%	44.7%	16.9%	18.9%	42.9%	57.1%	6.7%
56	1710	Kenwood	14	Gen	516	67.2%	89.6%	10.4%	16.4%	19.6%	46.2%	53.8%	9.0%
57	1110	Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	67.0%	67.2%	32.8%	9.6%	25.8%	65.2%	34.8%	2.1%
58	1830	Orr	5	Gen	589	65.4%	53.2%	46.8%	12.5%	25.1%	48.5%	51.5%	6.8%
59	1220	Austin	7	Gen	882	65.2%	34.6%	65.4%	6.2%	30.5%	45.3%	54.7%	4.2%
60	1620	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	64.2%	51.7%	48.3%	12.0%	27.0%	47.7%	52.3%	11.0%
61	1040	Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	64.0%	66.4%	33.6%	6.6%	31.0%	38.3%	61.7%	3.2%
62	1570	Sullivan	2	Gen	325	63.4%	69.9%	30.1%	24.5%	16.0%	44.9%	55.1%	5.8%
63	1020	Gregier Voc	9	Voc	217	60.8%	48.5%	51.5%	4.3%	36.4%	39.5%	60.5%	2.6%
		SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,140	76.5%	59.7%	40.3%	9.9%	15.0%	43.8%	56.2%	5.7%
		TOP THIRD TOTALS			11,412	[illegible]	68.5%	31.5%	7.8%	9.9%	46.8%	53.2%	4.9%
		MID THIRD TOTALS			12,224	77.1%	54.1%	45.9%	9.6%	14.5%	40.9%	59.1%	5.4%
		LOW THIRD TOTALS			9,258	69.0%	54.9%	45.1%	13.0%	20.6%	44.8%	55.2%	6.4%
		SPECIAL SCHOOLS TOTALS			246	27.2%	50.7%	49.3%	28.0%	61.4%	43.0%	57.0%	8.2%

Students who transfer from one Chicago high school to another drop out far more than did students who remained at one school. However, Graduation and Dropout Rates for students transferring within the Chicago system do not vary significantly with the stability of the schools from which the students transferred (see Table 7). For the most stable schools, the 1982 Dropout Rate for transfers within the system was 22 percentage points higher than for students who stayed at their original unit. For the middle and lower thirds, the difference was 13 and 10 points respectively. Systemwide, transfers within the system dropped out at a 16% higher rate (56% vs. 40%) than did non-transfers.

Some schools have high rates of transfers to other Chicago schools. Seven had more than a quarter of their entering students transfer away:

1.	Cregier Vocational	36%
2.	Flower Vocational	31%
3.	Austin	30%
4.	Lincoln Park	27%
5.	Richards Vocational	25%
6.	Harper	25%
7.	Orr	25%

All of these schools had overwhelming minority enrollments. Except for Richards and Flower, all had Dropout Rates in excess of 46%. However, transferring away from these schools was not a successful strategy for most students, for the Dropout Rate of the transfers was higher than for remaining students, in every case. In fact, for only two schools in the 21 schools with the highest transfer out proportions (Near North Career Magnet--then called Cooley--and Calumet), did students transferring away graduate more frequently than remaining students, and both those schools had very high Dropout Rates (60% and 55%). While Cregier Vocational and Richards Vocational both received correspondingly high numbers of students transferring in, the other five high activity schools received far fewer transfers than they lost. Among the 21 schools with the highest transfer proportions, only Near North Career Magnet received more than it lost (probably reflecting the beginning of the program change), and only five schools received comparable numbers of transfers to those they lost. The other 15 schools lost enrollment through transfers. In only six of these schools (Near North Career Magnet, Lincoln Park, Collins, Lindbloom, Westinghouse, and Young), did students transferring in drop out less frequently than students who started there.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

TABLE 8

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	PERCENT COMPLETED ORIG UNIT	ORIG UNIT GRAD RATE	ORIG UNIT DROPOUT RATE	ORIG UNIT TRANSFER RATE	PERCENT TRANSF FROM CHI PUB HS	TRANSF FROM CHI PUB HS GRAD RATE	TRANSF FROM CHI PUB HS DROP RATE	TRANSF FROM CHI PUB HS TRANSF RATE
	1060	Jones Commercia	11	Comm						100.0%	95.2%	4.8%	2.7%
1	1800	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	46	84.8%	64.1%	35.9%	7.1%	128.3%	61.0%	39.0%	0.0%
2	1050	Near No. Career	3	Voc	87	69.0%	40.0%	60.0%	11.8%	58.6%	44.7%	55.3%	7.8%
3	1020	Cregier Voc	9	Voc	217	60.8%	48.5%	51.5%	4.3%	29.0%	19.0%	81.0%	4.5%
4	1110	Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	67.0%	67.2%	32.8%	9.6%	25.8%	43.5%	56.5%	2.1%
5	1310	Fenger	20	Gen	558	76.0%	44.8%	55.2%	11.9%	25.8%	34.9%	65.1%	9.8%
6	1570	Sullivan	2	Gen	325	63.4%	69.9%	30.1%	24.5%	22.8%	36.6%	63.4%	4.1%
7	1380	Hirsh	17	Gen	359	69.9%	56.6%	43.4%	10.0%	21.7%	44.0%	56.0%	2.6%
8	1590	Tilden	13	Gen	563	77.1%	49.1%	50.9%	10.1%	19.4%	30.2%	69.8%	2.8%
9	1040	Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	64.0%	66.4%	33.6%	6.6%	18.5%	56.8%	43.2%	0.0%
10	1520	Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	75.9%	50.0%	50.0%	14.7%	18.4%	40.5%	59.5%	7.5%
11	1370	Harrison +	8	Gen	322	67.4%	55.3%	44.7%	16.9%	17.1%	32.1%	67.9%	3.6%
12	1410	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	347	73.5%	55.7%	44.3%	16.7%	16.7%	28.6%	71.4%	3.4%
13	1320	Robeson	16	Gen	658	70.1%	43.2%	56.8%	17.1%	15.8%	45.5%	54.5%	14.6%
14	1270	Crane	9	Gen	628	76.3%	39.0%	61.0%	6.1%	15.4%	32.2%	67.8%	7.2%
15	1620	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	64.2%	51.7%	48.3%	12.0%	15.3%	60.0%	40.0%	4.8%
16	1330	Foreman	4	Gen	311	72.7%	64.6%	35.4%	21.3%	14.8%	47.6%	52.4%	8.7%
17	1360	Harper	15	Gen	457	68.1%	49.2%	50.8%	9.1%	14.4%	33.9%	66.1%	6.1%
18	1240	Bowen	19	Gen	773	80.1%	54.3%	45.7%	8.6%	14.4%	32.6%	67.4%	8.7%
19	1300	Farragut	10	Gen	569	73.8%	46.0%	54.0%	6.7%	14.2%	40.3%	59.7%	5.3%
20	1390	Hyde Park	14	Gen	724	79.7%	66.3%	34.7%	5.9%	13.8%	36.7%	63.3%	2.0%
21	1680	Englewood	16	Gen	594	76.3%	48.1%	51.9%	6.8%	13.8%	37.2%	62.8%	3.7%
22	1850	Carver	20	Gen	616	79.1%	52.1%	47.9%	4.9%	13.8%	40.7%	59.3%	3.6%
23	1420	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	85.7%	72.2%	27.8%	6.8%	13.5%	19.1%	80.9%	4.1%
24	1880	Collins	8	Gen	440	76.4%	55.7%	44.3%	4.3%	13.4%	61.4%	38.6%	3.4%
25	1530	Schurz	4	Gen	940	78.3%	52.2%	47.8%	13.2%	13.1%	24.6%	75.4%	6.6%
26	1480	Mather	2	Gen	382	83.2%	79.9%	20.1%	10.7%	12.8%	45.7%	54.3%	6.1%
27	1280	DuSable	13	Gen	632	85.1%	41.3%	58.7%	4.3%	12.7%	13.7%	86.3%	6.4%
28	1470	Marshall	9	Gen	546	73.4%	45.6%	54.4%	5.2%	12.5%	31.3%	68.8%	3.0%
29	1670	Hubbard	15	Gen	341	83.3%	60.2%	39.8%	11.0%	12.3%	41.0%	59.0%	7.1%
30	1250	Calumet	16	Gen	752	71.8%	45.2%	54.8%	10.6%	12.1%	18.1%	81.9%	8.8%
31	1830	Orr	5	Gen	589	65.4%	53.2%	46.8%	12.5%	11.9%	41.5%	58.5%	4.4%
32	1550	South Shore	17	Gen	723	77.3%	47.8%	52.2%	7.8%	11.6%	32.9%	67.1%	9.5%
33	1640	Wells	6	Gen	569	70.5%	45.4%	54.6%	16.5%	11.6%	34.5%	65.5%	12.1%
34	1760	King,M.L.	14	Gen	454	78.4%	50.6%	49.4%	5.8%	11.5%	31.4%	68.6%	1.9%
35	1150	Sirsen Voc	16	Voc	484	79.8%	70.5%	29.5%	7.2%	11.0%	82.4%	17.6%	3.8%
36	1460	Manley	8	Gen	573	75.7%	47.9%	52.1%	4.6%	10.6%	30.0%	70.0%	1.6%
37	1220	Austin	7	Gen	882	65.2%	34.6%	65.4%	6.2%	10.3%	23.5%	76.5%	6.6%
38	1430	Lakeview	3	Gen	452	69.5%	51.3%	48.7%	16.7%	10.2%	36.6%	63.4%	10.9%
39	1160	Westinghouse Vo	7	Voc	433	79.4%	82.6%	17.4%	3.6%	10.2%	95.3%	4.7%	2.3%
40	1210	Amundsen	2	Gen	398	76.4%	57.2%	42.8%	14.8%	10.1%	47.1%	52.9%	15.0%
41	1560	Steinmetz	4	Gen	524	83.8%	66.7%	33.3%	11.0%	9.9%	46.8%	53.2%	9.6%
42	1230	Bogan	15	Gen	300	89.3%	91.0%	9.0%	7.6%	9.7%	65.5%	34.5%	0.0%
43	1580	Taft	1	Gen	509	90.0%	83.8%	16.2%	6.1%	9.6%	65.9%	34.1%	10.2%
44	1400	Kelly	8	Gen	416	84.9%	47.9%	52.1%	9.9%	9.4%	33.3%	66.7%	0.0%
45	1030	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	82.6%	73.5%	26.5%	7.4%	9.4%	71.7%	28.3%	7.0%
46	1840	Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	77.3%	46.4%	53.6%	12.4%	9.3%	42.5%	57.5%	10.3%
47	1540	Senn	2	Gen	597	71.5%	58.8%	41.2%	14.9%	8.9%	32.0%	68.0%	5.7%
48	1610	Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	75.1%	70.4%	29.6%	18.0%	7.5%	52.0%	48.0%	3.8%
49	1510	Phillips	11	Gen	858	80.1%	41.8%	58.2%	5.6%	7.2%	30.5%	69.5%	4.8%
50	1710	Kenwood	14	Gen	516	67.2%	89.6%	10.4%	16.4%	7.0%	76.0%	24.0%	30.6%
51	1340	Gage Park	12	Gen	503	79.3%	51.9%	48.1%	8.1%	6.6%	16.7%	83.3%	9.1%
52	1630	Washington	20	Gen	369	90.0%	77.4%	22.6%	8.0%	6.5%	57.1%	42.9%	8.7%
53	1870	Julian	18	Gen	573	83.4%	70.3%	29.7%	6.5%	6.3%	60.0%	40.0%	6.3%
54	1810	Young	9	Gen	559	74.2%	88.2%	11.8%	10.9%	6.1%	91.2%	8.8%	0.0%
55	1820	Curie	12	Gen	735	82.2%	74.8%	25.2%	9.4%	5.9%	65.8%	34.2%	11.6%
56	1890	Juarez	8	Gen	506	79.1%	50.0%	50.0%	14.6%	5.7%	69.0%	31.0%	0.0%
57	1440	Lane	3	Tech	882	81.2%	87.3%	12.7%	10.1%	5.2%	95.3%	4.7%	6.5%
58	1860	Corliss	20	Gen	621	76.0%	70.6%	29.4%	12.1%	4.8%	48.1%	51.9%	10.0%
59	1350	Harlan	19	Gen	696	79.0%	58.4%	41.6%	7.3%	4.2%	48.3%	51.7%	0.0%
60	1070	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	306	79.8%	78.2%	21.8%	9.4%	3.1%	54.5%	45.5%	8.3%
61	1450	Lindblom	15	Tech	616	73.7%	83.0%	17.0%	10.3%	2.9%	94.1%	5.9%	5.6%
62	1010	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	81.7%	75.5%	24.5%	6.5%	2.4%	73.9%	26.1%	8.0%
63	1490	Morgan Park	18	Gen	469	86.1%	76.0%	24.0%	6.9%	1.3%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%
		SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,140	76.5%	59.7%	40.3%	9.9%	13.3%	44.6%	55.4%	6.0%
		TOP THIRD TOTALS			8,629	73.2%	52.2%	47.8%	11.1%	18.4%	38.4%	61.6%	5.7%
		MID THIRD TOTALS			11,400	76.5%	55.0%	45.0%	8.9%	11.7%	37.6%	62.4%	6.2%
		LOW THIRD TOTALS			12,865	79.6%	68.4%	31.6%	9.8%	6.1%	56.1%	43.9%	7.6%
		SPECIAL SCHOOLS TOTALS			246	27.2%	50.7%	49.3%	28.0%	136.6%	17.7%	82.3%	5.8%
		SCHOOLS WITHOUT FRESHMEN T			1,172	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR	100.0%	51.8%	48.2%	2.9%

Some schools had very few transfers to other Chicago Schools. Generally, these schools received more transfers from within the system than they lost. In all but six cases, the Dropout Rate for continuous students in these schools was under 40%, and in half the schools, it was under 30%. Students transferring away from these schools dropped out more than 55% of the time. But in most cases, transferring into these schools did not result in comparable success; in only two schools (Juarez and Lane) did transfers from other Chicago schools graduate more frequently than continuously enrolled students. However, in most schools, transfers in graduated more frequently than those transferring out. Three schools were particularly inhospitable to transfers from other Chicago schools: DuSable (Dropout Rate for transfers in of 86%), Kennedy (81%), and Schurz (75%). At the other extreme, Lane received transfers equal to only 5% of its entering class, but 95% of these students graduated!

Thus, in most schools for the Class of 1982, those students who remained at the school in which they originally enrolled were more likely to graduate than were those who transferred at another Chicago high school.

One other note: this analysis provides the opportunity to comment on Jones Commercial Metropolitan High School. Since all of its students transfer in, primarily from other Chicago high schools, this is the only point at which its students are separately discernible. There were 367 students from the Class of 1982 who transferred into Jones. Later, 2.7% transferred out of the Chicago system. Of the remaining students, 95% graduated. This outstanding record is undergirded by the special conditions at Jones: it receives only Juniors and Seniors who are carefully selected and then further benefit from extensive work/study arrangements. Thus, the one sure-fire transfer strategy is to transfer into Jones.

F. INCIDENCE OF SIGNIFICANT STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

1. OVERAGE

26% of all entering freshmen in the Class of 1982 were overage. Of these, 61% drop out (vs. 38% of normal age students); overage students represent more than a third (37%) of all Dropouts.

Generally speaking, the higher the concentration of overage students, the worse schools do with these students. Accordingly, the overage Dropout Rate for the 21 schools with the highest concentration of overage students was 65%. These schools varied from 33% overage to a high of 50% (at Robeson). Only one of these schools, Senn (49%) has an overage Dropout Rate below 50%. But for the 21 schools with the fewest overage students (all below 20% and as few as 3% at Lane, 4% at Metro, and 5% at Lindbloom), the aggregate overage

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

RANK ORDER BY PERCENT OVERAGE

TABLE 9

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	CATEGORY	ENTERING FRESHMEN	PERCENT OVERAGE	OVERAGE TRANSFER RATE	OVERAGE DROPOUT RATE	NORM AGE TRANSFER RATE	NORM AGE DROPOUT RATE
1	1320	Robeson	16	Gen	654	50.2%	14.6%	65.0%	16.9%	49.4%
2	1890	Juarez	8	Gen	504	46.8%	12.3%	56.0%	15.3%	46.3%
3	1020	Crespler Voc	9	Voc	216	40.3%	2.3%	74.1%	4.7%	41.5%
4	1680	Englewood	16	Gen	585	40.2%	5.1%	60.5%	7.1%	48.6%
5	1050	Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	86	38.4%	12.1%	75.9%	9.4%	50.0%
6	1510	Phillips	11	Gen	849	38.2%	5.6%	69.9%	4.8%	49.8%
7	1270	Crane	9	Gen	620	37.6%	2.6%	76.7%	8.0%	53.7%
8	1250	Calumet	16	Gen	749	37.2%	8.6%	65.9%	11.3%	45.8%
9	1280	DuSable	13	Gen	628	36.8%	4.8%	71.8%	3.8%	50.8%
10	1470	Marshall	9	Gen	543	36.6%	4.5%	71.1%	4.7%	49.4%
11	1460	Manley	8	Gen	568	36.4%	3.9%	66.3%	5.3%	45.6%
12	1370	Harrison +	8	Gen	321	36.1%	19.0%	60.6%	12.7%	40.2%
13	1380	Hirsh	17	Gen	359	35.4%	7.1%	54.2%	9.5%	41.0%
14	1360	Harper	15	Gen	455	35.2%	6.3%	67.3%	9.2%	45.9%
15	1640	Wells	6	Gen	568	34.9%	14.6%	65.7%	15.4%	50.2%
16	1760	King, M.L.	14	Gen	453	34.0%	6.5%	63.9%	5.0%	43.3%
17	1880	Collins	8	Gen	440	33.4%	4.1%	60.3%	4.8%	41.9%
18	1540	Senn	2	Gen	596	32.7%	11.8%	50.0%	14.7%	38.6%
19	1240	Bowen	19	Gen	770	32.5%	8.8%	60.1%	7.5%	41.8%
20	1300	Farragut	10	Gen	564	32.4%	6.0%	70.9%	6.6%	47.8%
21	1590	Tilden	13	Gen	558	31.7%	9.6%	58.8%	8.7%	48.9%
22	1850	Carver	20	Gen	613	31.0%	5.3%	68.3%	5.2%	39.4%
23	1840	Clemente	6	Gen	1,058	30.6%	13.0%	64.2%	11.0%	52.7%
24	1830	Orr	5	Gen	586	30.5%	14.5%	62.7%	9.6%	41.8%
25	1410	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	346	30.3%	17.1%	51.7%	14.5%	41.3%
26	1310	Fenger	20	Gen	558	29.7%	12.0%	73.3%	11.2%	49.1%
27	1620	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	273	28.9%	8.9%	58.3%	12.9%	45.6%
28	1490	Morgan Park	18	Gen	467	27.6%	7.8%	44.5%	6.2%	20.5%
29	1220	Austin *	7	Gen	878	27.3%	4.6%	75.5%	6.0%	57.0%
30	1210	Amundsen	2	Gen	397	26.4%	14.3%	56.7%	14.7%	41.8%
31	1430	Lakeview	3	Gen	451	26.4%	19.3%	59.4%	14.5%	49.6%
32	1350	Harlan	19	Gen	692	26.3%	5.5%	55.8%	7.3%	39.1%
33	1550	South Shore	17	Gen	720	23.9%	5.8%	71.0%	8.0%	47.6%
34	1530	Schurz	4	Gen	937	23.8%	10.3%	59.0%	13.4%	45.6%
35	1670	Hubbard	15	Gen	341	22.6%	11.7%	60.3%	11.4%	34.6%
36	1330	Foreman	4	Gen	311	22.5%	24.3%	52.8%	18.3%	33.5%
37	1570	Sullivan	2	Gen	325	22.5%	19.2%	37.3%	22.2%	34.2%
38	1400	Kelly	8	Gen	412	22.3%	14.1%	59.5%	9.4%	50.7%
39	1610	Von Steuben	1	Gen	345	22.3%	22.1%	38.3%	15.7%	28.8%
40	1520	Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	20.9%	16.5%	60.5%	13.1%	47.8%
41	1150	Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	20.2%	3.1%	42.1%	7.5%	31.9%
42	1630	Washington	20	Gen	369	19.8%	6.8%	45.6%	8.1%	18.0%
43	1110	Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	19.8%	5.6%	52.9%	8.2%	28.4%
44	1230	Bogan	15	Gen	300	19.3%	10.3%	25.0%	7.0%	7.6%
45	1040	Flower Voc	7	Voc	199	19.1%	0.0%	50.0%	6.8%	40.7%
46	1560	Steinmetz	4	Gen	523	18.5%	9.3%	51.1%	10.6%	31.2%
47	1340	Gage Park	12	Gen	503	18.3%	9.8%	68.7%	6.8%	44.6%
48	1870	Julian	18	Gen	572	17.5%	2.0%	50.0%	7.8%	28.5%
49	1420	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	16.8%	4.8%	50.8%	6.8%	25.1%
50	1820	Curie	12	Gen	731	15.6%	7.9%	55.2%	9.2%	24.1%
51	1390	Hyde Park	14	Gen	722	15.5%	7.1%	59.6%	5.6%	33.7%
52	1860	Corliss	20	Gen	614	15.3%	9.6%	56.5%	11.5%	29.3%
53	1480	Mather	2	Gen	382	14.9%	10.5%	37.3%	10.2%	19.2%
54	1160	Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	431	13.0%	1.8%	38.2%	3.7%	19.7%
55	1030	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	11.3%	10.1%	51.6%	6.3%	25.1%
56	1010	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,029	9.5%	9.2%	51.7%	6.2%	24.6%
57	1710	Kenwood	14	Gen	515	9.5%	26.5%	36.1%	13.7%	17.9%
58	1580	Taft	1	Gen	508	8.5%	7.0%	42.5%	6.0%	16.0%
59	1070	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	8.3%	9.4%	41.4%	9.6%	21.3%
60	1810	Young	9	Gen	557	7.9%	6.8%	39.0%	10.5%	17.2%
61	1450	Lindblom	15	Tech	614	4.9%	20.0%	33.3%	9.9%	21.5%
62	1800	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	4.2%	0.0%	50.0%	6.5%	39.5%
63	1440	Lane	3	Tech	882	2.7%	20.8%	15.8%	9.1%	15.9%
		SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,000	25.5%	9.2%	60.9%	9.3%	36.6%
		TOP THIRD TOTALS			11,086	37.0%	8.1%	65.0%	8.7%	46.5%
		MID THIRD TOTALS			10,998	26.0%	11.1%	60.3%	10.7%	42.4%
		LOW THIRD TOTALS			10,676	12.2%	8.6%	49.2%	8.3%	24.2%
		SPECIAL SCHOOL TOTALS			240	59.6%	8.4%	63.4%	26.8%	38.0%

Dropout Rate was 48%, and for several of these schools the rate was below 40%. Bogan had the lowest Dropout Rate for overage students at 25%, but few other schools did particularly well with overage students.

Some schools, with low concentrations of overage students, did significantly worse than their counterparts. Metro, with only 4% overage, had half drop out. CVS, with less than 10% overage, had 52% of them drop out. Similarly, Dunbar with only 11% also lost 52%. Richards Vocational, Flower, Steinmetz, Julian, Kennedy, Curie, Hyde Park, and Corliss all had fewer than 20% of their entering students overage, but lost more than half of these older students.

2. CLASS SIZE

The size of the entering freshman class varied tremendously between schools in the Chicago system in 1982. Clemente had the largest entering class (1,067), and, exclusive of the special schools, Metro had the smallest (48). Systemwide, the average was 522. The 21 schools with the largest entering classes averaged 722 per class, while the 21 smallest averaged 305 per class. In the aggregate, the larger and mid-sized schools did comparably, a Dropout Rate of about 44%, while the smaller schools, in aggregate, had a 36% Dropout Rate.

However, aggregating schools by size hides the large differences among these schools. In the largest schools, five had Dropout Rates under 30% (Lane Tech. - 16%, Lindbloom Tech. - 22%, CVS - 27%, Dunbar Vocational - 28%, and Curie - 29%). All of these schools are selective of the students they enroll. At the same time, nine had Dropout Rates over 50% (Crane - 63%, Austin - 62%, DuSable - 58%, Phillips - 57%, Robeson - 57%, Clemente - 56%, Englewood - 54%, Calumet - 53%, and South Shore - 53%). Similar diversity of performance was found amid mid-sized schools, with four under 30% Dropouts and eleven over 50%. But among smaller schools, there were far fewer schools (3) with more Dropouts than Graduates. Six had Dropout Rates under 30%. Thus smaller schools were less likely to do poorly, but for schools with more than 435 in the entering class, size did not appear to be a significant factor in determining Dropout Rates. Size also did not appear to be a significant factor in the proportion of entering students who were overage nor in the proportion who completed their schooling at the unit in which they originally enrolled.

The largest schools serve minority students in most cases. Only four of these schools had more than 10% White students, and three of these were predominantly White (Lane - 65%, Schurz - 61%, and Curie - 57%). Two of these schools (Lane and Curie) offered specialized programs. Sikxteen of the largest schools were more than 98% minority (15 all Black and Clemente, 81% Hispanic). Senn was rather evenly mixed racially, while Bowen was 59% Black and 39% Hispanic.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

HIGH SCHOOLS RANKED BY CLASS SIZE

TABLE 10

RANK	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	TRANSFER RATE	DROPOUTS	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED w/ ORIG 9TH	PERCENT NORMAL SCORES
1	Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	11.5%	525	56.1%	7.3%	10.8%	0.6%	81.1%	30.6%	88.9%	26.3%
2	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	6.5%	261	27.1%	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.5%	9.5%	87.4%	85.3%
3	Schurz	4	Gen	940	12.7%	400	48.9%	61.3%	3.7%	2.7%	30.6%	23.8%	90.3%	51.6%
4	Lane	3	Tech	882	9.4%	127	15.9%	64.9%	12.1%	11.9%	10.8%	2.7%	90.2%	96.6%
5	Austin	7	Gen	882	5.6%	515	62.1%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	27.4%	69.5%	18.4%
6	Phillips	11	Gen	858	5.0%	463	57.4%	0.1%	99.5%	0.0%	0.3%	38.2%	85.5%	23.5%
7	Bowen	19	Gen	773	7.9%	338	47.7%	1.7%	58.7%	0.1%	38.7%	32.5%	87.8%	30.9%
8	Calumet	16	Gen	752	10.2%	359	53.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	80.6%	36.3%
9	Curie	12	Gen	735	9.0%	193	29.0%	57.3%	25.7%	1.1%	15.4%	15.6%	91.0%	57.1%
10	Hyde Park	14	Gen	724	5.8%	256	37.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	84.7%	57.7%
11	South Shore	17	Gen	723	7.5%	355	53.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.1%	23.9%	83.8%	38.0%
12	Harlan	19	Gen	696	6.8%	281	43.6%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	26.3%	85.2%	38.4%
13	Robeson	16	Gen	658	15.7%	316	57.4%	0.3%	99.5%	0.0%	0.0%	50.2%	84.5%	44.1%
14	DuSable	13	Gen	632	4.1%	352	58.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	89.2%	27.7%
15	Crane	9	Gen	628	5.9%	365	62.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.6%	82.0%	40.3%
16	Curtiss	20	Gen	621	11.1%	183	33.6%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	86.6%	55.7%
17	Carver	20	Gen	616	5.2%	281	48.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	83.6%	45.1%
18	Lindblom	15	Tech	616	10.4%	121	22.0%	0.2%	95.8%	3.7%	0.3%	4.9%	82.1%	31.3%
19	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	6.7%	159	28.0%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	11.3%	89.1%	82.9%
20	Senn	2	Gen	597	13.7%	218	42.4%	36.0%	19.6%	21.7%	21.7%	32.7%	84.1%	29.8%
21	Englewood	16	Gen	594	6.2%	293	53.5%	0.0%	99.0%	0.0%	0.2%	40.2%	83.0%	34.8%
22	Orr	5	Gen	589	11.0%	250	48.0%	3.1%	69.1%	0.8%	25.5%	30.5%	74.9%	21.7%
23	Manley	8	Gen	573	4.7%	288	53.2%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	36.4%	80.3%	19.7%
24	Julian	18	Gen	573	6.8%	173	32.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	17.5%	89.2%	56.5%
25	Wells	6	Gen	569	15.1%	268	55.6%	12.1%	25.8%	0.0%	61.7%	34.9%	84.5%	30.8%
26	Farragut	10	Gen	569	6.3%	292	55.3%	0.9%	76.4%	0.2%	22.5%	32.4%	79.3%	30.2%
27	Tilden	13	Gen	563	8.9%	264	51.8%	10.1%	75.7%	0.2%	13.9%	31.7%	86.0%	24.6%
28	Young	9	Gen	559	10.2%	95	19.0%	27.5%	52.2%	5.5%	12.2%	7.9%	83.4%	63.1%
29	Fenger	20	Gen	558	11.5%	278	56.3%	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.7%	29.7%	86.2%	26.9%
30	Marshall	9	Gen	546	4.6%	297	57.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.0%	36.6%	77.7%	22.2%
31	Steinmetz	4	Gen	524	10.3%	164	35.0%	76.1%	15.1%	4.0%	4.0%	18.5%	94.1%	57.4%
32	Kenwood	14	Gen	516	14.9%	85	19.4%	17.8%	72.9%	2.7%	1.6%	9.5%	80.4%	70.3%
33	Taft	1	Gen	509	6.1%	87	18.2%	91.0%	6.7%	0.6%	1.8%	8.5%	95.9%	79.0%
34	Juarez	8	Gen	508	13.8%	221	50.9%	4.7%	1.8%	0.0%	92.1%	46.8%	93.3%	25.0%
35	Gage Park	12	Gen	503	7.4%	228	48.9%	38.9%	52.3%	0.8%	8.0%	18.3%	86.3%	40.8%
36	Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	6.6%	154	34.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	86.0%	75.8%
37	Morgan Park	18	Gen	469	6.6%	118	27.1%	35.4%	63.1%	0.2%	0.6%	27.6%	92.5%	60.8%
38	Harper	15	Gen	457	8.1%	224	53.6%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	35.2%	74.8%	21.2%
39	King, M.L.	14	Gen	454	5.5%	215	50.2%	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	34.0%	83.5%	28.0%
40	Lakeview	3	Gen	452	15.7%	198	52.1%	40.3%	11.1%	6.0%	41.2%	26.4%	83.6%	43.6%
41	Collins	8	Gen	440	4.5%	202	48.1%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	79.8%	26.1%
42	Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	13.8%	189	50.4%	67.8%	6.4%	9.2%	15.4%	20.9%	89.0%	52.2%
43	Westinghouse Vo	7	Voc	433	3.5%	92	22.1%	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	82.7%	85.0%
44	Kelly	8	Gen	416	10.3%	194	52.6%	73.1%	0.0%	1.0%	26.0%	22.4%	94.2%	49.8%
45	Amundsen	2	Gen	398	14.6%	155	45.7%	74.9%	4.0%	7.5%	10.6%	26.4%	89.7%	43.2%
46	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	9.6%	80	22.9%	58.7%	22.0%	1.3%	21.2%	8.3%	88.1%	72.8%
47	Mather	2	Gen	382	10.2%	75	21.8%	78.3%	10.2%	11.5%	2.9%	14.9%	93.2%	71.2%
48	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	6.5%	102	29.5%	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	2.2%	16.8%	91.9%	69.5%
49	Washington	20	Gen	369	7.9%	80	23.5%	83.5%	0.3%	0.8%	13.8%	19.8%	97.8%	71.0%
50	Hirsh	17	Gen	359	8.6%	150	45.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.4%	77.7%	37.3%
51	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	347	15.3%	130	44.4%	34.0%	1.2%	1.7%	62.8%	30.3%	88.2%	39.2%
52	Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	17.1%	88	30.8%	46.5%	22.8%	12.7%	17.3%	22.3%	91.6%	52.6%
53	Hubbard	15	Gen	341	11.4%	122	40.4%	85.3%	2.9%	1.2%	9.7%	22.6%	93.5%	68.0%
54	Sullivan	2	Gen	325	21.5%	89	34.3%	43.7%	32.0%	9.5%	12.6%	22.5%	84.0%	48.0%
55	Harrison +	8	Gen	322	14.9%	129	47.3%	4.7%	37.3%	0.3%	57.1%	36.1%	81.1%	30.7%
56	Foreman	4	Gen	311	19.6%	94	37.6%	85.5%	1.0%	0.6%	12.2%	22.5%	92.3%	56.9%
57	Bogan	15	Gen	300	7.7%	30	10.8%	95.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	19.3%	96.7%	82.7%
58	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	11.7%	119	49.4%	8.8%	66.7%	0.7%	23.0%	28.9%	73.0%	36.5%
59	Gregler Voc	9	Voc	217	3.7%	114	54.8%	0.9%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	40.3%	63.6%	32.7%
60	Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	5.5%	80	42.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%	69.0%	38.0%
61	Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	7.7%	56	33.3%	26.4%	23.6%	0.0%	46.2%	19.8%	74.2%	56.0%
62	Near No. Career	3	Voc	87	10.3%	46	59.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.4%	78.2%	27.6%
63	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	6.3%	18	40.0%	25.0%	64.6%	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%	87.5%	91.7%
523	SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,142	9.2%	12,804	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%
AVG CLASS SIZE														
734	TOP THIRD TOTALS			15,633	8.5%	6,361	44.7%	12.0%	74.2%	1.9%	11.5%	25.4%	85.3%	47.9%
516	MID THIRD TOTALS			10,850	9.2%	4,290	43.7%	19.6%	63.7%	1.4%	14.6%	26.5%	84.7%	41.4%
309	LOW THIRD TOTALS			6,500	11.3%	2,059	35.8%	47.4%	32.9%	2.7%	16.0%	22.9%	86.4%	55.7%
	SPECIAL SCHOOLS TOTALS			159	7.5%	94	65.3%	6.9%	61.0%	0.0%	30.2%	71.8%	22.6%	3.8%

PERCENT OF RACE IN EACH THIRD OF CLASS	Top Third	26.5%	55.9%	27.3%	47.6%
	Mid Third	29.9%	33.3%	27.3%	23.9%
	Low Third	43.4%	10.3%	42.4%	28.5%
	Spec. Sch.	0.2%	0.5%	3.0%	0.0%

Among the smallest schools, nine were majority White and five others had more than 25% of their students who were White. Only five were all Black. Two were majority Hispanic (Kelvyn Park and Harrison - which has since been closed and its students transferred to Farragut, a mid-sized school; the combination of Harrison and Farragut would have been ranked fourth largest in the system in the Fall of 1978 when the Class of '82 entered high school). 43% of all Whites attended the smallest schools, as did 42% of the less numerous Asians. Conversely, 56% of all Blacks and 48% of all Hispanics attended the system's largest schools.

Reading scores were unevenly distributed among groupings of schools by size. 56% of students entering the smallest schools read at normal or above rates. Only 48% of students at the largest schools were at normal levels, and only 41% of those at mid-sized schools were. The inclusion of the selective schools (Lane Tech. - 97% at normal levels or above, CVS - 85%, Dunbar Vocational - 83%, and Lindbloom Tech. - 81%) dramatically raised the aggregate scores. In contrast, ten of these schools had less than 40% of their entering students with normal or above test scores. Thus, aside from a few selective schools, the system's large schools were reserved for minority students who were generally poorly prepared for high school level work.

3. READING SCORES

Schools vary significantly on the proportion of their entering freshmen who have normal or above reading scores. Dropout Rates generally vary inversely with this proportion. Thus, Lane Tech., with 97% of its students reading at or above normal, has one of the lowest Dropout Rates in the system (16%); conversely, Austin receives only 18% of its students reading at normal levels and has a Dropout Rate of 62% (second worst to Crane at 63%).

Seven schools had more than 80% of their entering students at or above normal reading levels. Except for Metro, all graduated more than 70% of their students, and two (Bogan - 89%, and Lane - 84%) graduated over 80%. However, only Bogan had a Graduation Rate higher than the percent of its students reading at or above normal levels. Among the next six schools receiving over 70% reading at normal rates, Taft, Prosser, Mather, Washington, and Kenwood all graduated higher proportions of the class. Schools with high proportions of well-prepared students are quite stable. Among the 13 schools with the highest proportion of their students reading at normal levels, only Kenwood (80%), Lindbloom (80%) and Westinghouse (83%) had less than 85% of their students finish at the school where they originally enrolled.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

HIGH SCHOOLS RANKED BY PERCENT NORMAL READING SCORES

TABLE 11

RANK	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	TRANSFER RATE	DROPOUTS	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED GRAD SCH	PERCENT NORMAL SCORES	PERCENT W/O SCORES	PERCENT BELOW NORM SCORES
1	Lane	3	Tech	882	9.4%	127	15.9%	64.3%	12.1%	11.3%	10.8%	2.7%	90.2%	96.6%	3.2%	0.2%
2	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	6.3%	18	40.0%	25.0%	64.6%	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%	87.5%	91.7%	2.1%	6.3%
3	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	6.5%	261	27.1%	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.5%	9.5%	87.4%	85.3%	4.8%	9.9%
4	Westinghouse Vo	7	Voc	433	3.5%	92	22.1%	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	82.7%	85.0%	2.1%	12.9%
5	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	6.7%	159	28.0%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	11.3%	89.1%	82.9%	5.9%	11.2%
6	Jaspar	15	Gen	300	7.7%	30	10.8%	95.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	19.3%	96.7%	82.7%	9.7%	7.7%
7	Lindblom	15	Tech	616	10.4%	121	22.0%	0.2%	95.8%	3.7%	0.3%	4.3%	82.1%	81.3%	17.0%	1.6%
8	Taft	1	Gen	509	6.1%	87	18.2%	91.0%	6.7%	0.6%	1.8%	8.5%	95.9%	79.0%	10.0%	11.0%
9	Curie Voc	16	Voc	484	6.6%	154	34.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	86.0%	75.8%	5.8%	18.4%
10	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	9.6%	80	22.9%	54.7%	22.0%	1.3%	21.2%	8.3%	88.1%	72.8%	24.4%	2.8%
11	Mather	2	Gen	382	10.2%	75	21.9%	74.3%	10.2%	11.5%	2.9%	14.9%	93.2%	71.2%	14.1%	14.7%
12	Washington	20	Gen	369	7.3%	80	23.5%	83.5%	0.3%	0.8%	13.8%	19.8%	97.8%	71.0%	8.7%	20.3%
13	Kenwood	14	Gen	516	14.9%	85	19.4%	17.8%	72.9%	2.7%	1.6%	9.5%	80.4%	70.3%	12.2%	17.4%
14	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	6.5%	102	29.5%	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	2.2%	16.8%	91.8%	69.5%	9.2%	21.4%
15	Hubbard	15	Gen	341	11.4%	122	40.4%	95.2%	2.9%	1.2%	9.7%	22.6%	93.5%	68.0%	11.1%	20.8%
16	Young	9	Gen	559	10.2%	95	19.0%	27.5%	52.2%	5.5%	12.2%	7.9%	83.4%	63.1%	31.1%	5.7%
17	Morgan Park	18	Gen	469	6.6%	118	27.1%	35.4%	63.1%	0.2%	0.6%	27.6%	92.5%	60.2%	4.7%	34.5%
18	Lane Park	14	Gen	724	5.4%	256	37.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	84.7%	57.7%	6.4%	35.9%
19	Steinmetz	4	Gen	524	10.3%	164	35.0%	76.1%	15.1%	4.0%	4.0%	18.5%	94.1%	57.4%	13.7%	28.8%
20	Clune	12	Gen	735	9.0%	193	29.0%	57.3%	25.7%	1.1%	15.4%	15.6%	91.0%	57.1%	18.2%	24.6%
21	Foreman	4	Gen	311	19.6%	94	37.6%	95.5%	1.0%	0.6%	12.2%	22.5%	92.3%	56.3%	13.2%	29.3%
22	Julian	18	Gen	573	6.8%	173	32.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	17.5%	89.2%	56.5%	5.9%	37.5%
23	Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	7.7%	56	33.3%	26.4%	23.6%	0.0%	46.2%	19.8%	74.2%	56.0%	8.2%	35.7%
24	Cortez	20	Gen	621	11.1%	183	33.6%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	86.6%	55.7%	3.8%	40.4%
25	Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	17.1%	88	30.8%	46.5%	22.8%	12.7%	17.3%	22.3%	91.6%	52.6%	13.3%	34.1%
26	Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	13.8%	189	50.4%	67.8%	6.4%	9.2%	15.4%	20.9%	89.0%	52.2%	16.6%	31.3%
27	Schurz	4	Gen	940	12.7%	400	48.9%	61.3%	3.7%	2.7%	30.6%	23.8%	90.3%	51.6%	10.7%	37.7%
28	Kelly	8	Gen	416	10.3%	194	52.6%	73.1%	0.0%	1.0%	26.0%	22.4%	94.2%	49.8%	23.3%	26.9%
29	Sullivan	2	Gen	325	21.5%	89	34.9%	43.7%	32.0%	9.5%	12.6%	22.5%	84.0%	48.0%	17.5%	34.5%
30	Carver	20	Gen	616	5.2%	281	48.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	83.6%	45.1%	8.4%	46.4%
31	Morgan	16	Gen	668	15.7%	316	57.4%	0.3%	99.5%	0.0%	0.0%	30.2%	84.5%	44.1%	7.4%	48.5%
32	Lakeview	3	Gen	452	15.7%	198	52.1%	40.3%	11.1%	6.0%	41.2%	26.4%	93.6%	43.6%	17.0%	39.4%
33	Hamilton	2	Gen	398	14.6%	155	45.7%	74.3%	4.0%	7.5%	10.6%	26.4%	89.7%	43.2%	21.4%	35.4%
34	Taft Park	12	Gen	503	7.4%	228	48.3%	38.3%	52.3%	0.8%	8.0%	18.3%	86.3%	40.8%	5.8%	53.5%
35	Crane	3	Gen	628	5.3%	365	62.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.6%	82.0%	40.3%	9.2%	50.5%
36	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	347	15.3%	130	44.9%	34.0%	1.2%	1.7%	52.8%	30.3%	88.2%	39.2%	17.6%	43.2%
37	Harlan	19	Gen	696	6.8%	281	43.6%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	26.3%	85.2%	38.4%	8.5%	53.2%
38	South Shore	17	Gen	723	7.3%	355	53.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.1%	23.9%	83.8%	38.0%	10.7%	51.3%
39	Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	5.5%	80	42.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%	69.0%	38.0%	9.0%	53.0%
40	Marsh	17	Gen	359	8.6%	150	45.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.4%	77.7%	37.3%	6.7%	56.0%
41	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	11.7%	119	49.4%	8.8%	65.7%	0.7%	23.0%	28.3%	73.0%	36.5%	10.9%	52.6%
42	Calumet	16	Gen	752	10.2%	359	53.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	80.6%	36.3%	7.8%	55.9%
43	Englewood	16	Gen	594	6.2%	293	53.5%	0.0%	99.0%	0.0%	0.2%	40.2%	83.0%	34.8%	10.3%	54.9%
44	Chicago Voc	9	Voc	217	3.7%	114	54.8%	0.9%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	40.3%	63.6%	32.7%	7.4%	59.9%
45	Bowen	10	Gen	773	7.8%	338	47.7%	1.7%	58.7%	0.1%	38.7%	32.5%	87.8%	30.9%	17.6%	51.5%
46	Austin	6	Gen	569	15.1%	258	55.6%	12.1%	25.8%	0.0%	61.7%	34.9%	84.5%	30.8%	18.5%	50.8%
47	Harrison	8	Gen	322	14.9%	129	47.3%	4.7%	37.3%	0.3%	57.1%	36.1%	81.1%	30.7%	16.5%	52.8%
48	Farragut	10	Gen	569	6.3%	292	55.3%	0.9%	76.4%	0.2%	22.5%	32.4%	79.3%	30.2%	9.5%	60.3%
49	Senn	2	Gen	597	13.7%	218	42.4%	36.0%	19.6%	21.7%	21.7%	32.7%	84.1%	29.8%	30.2%	40.0%
50	Kurd, P.L.	14	Gen	454	5.5%	215	50.2%	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	34.0%	83.5%	28.0%	9.9%	62.1%
51	Dunbable	13	Gen	632	4.1%	352	58.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	89.2%	27.7%	7.1%	65.2%
52	West No. Career	3	Voc	87	10.3%	46	59.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.4%	78.2%	27.6%	13.8%	58.6%
53	Pulaski	20	Gen	558	11.5%	278	56.2%	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.7%	29.7%	86.2%	26.3%	10.8%	62.4%
54	Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	11.5%	525	56.1%	7.3%	10.8%	0.6%	81.1%	30.6%	88.3%	26.3%	14.6%	59.0%
55	Collins	8	Gen	440	4.5%	202	48.1%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	79.8%	26.1%	9.3%	64.5%
56	Juarez	8	Gen	508	13.4%	221	50.3%	4.7%	1.8%	0.0%	92.1%	46.8%	93.3%	25.0%	35.0%	40.0%
57	Tilden	13	Gen	563	8.9%	264	51.8%	10.1%	75.7%	0.2%	13.9%	31.7%	86.0%	24.6%	8.5%	67.0%
58	Phillips	11	Gen	858	5.0%	463	57.4%	0.1%	99.5%	0.0%	0.3%	38.2%	85.5%	23.5%	5.8%	70.5%
59	Marshall	9	Gen	546	4.6%	297	57.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.0%	36.6%	77.7%	22.2%	9.5%	68.3%
60	Orr	5	Gen	589	11.0%	250	48.0%	3.1%	69.1%	0.8%	25.5%	30.3%	74.3%	21.7%	11.4%	66.9%
61	Harper	15	Gen	457	8.1%	224	53.6%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	35.2%	74.8%	21.2%	7.0%	71.8%
62	Manley	8	Gen	573	4.7%	288	53.2%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	36.4%	80.3%	19.7%	7.0%	73.3%
63	Austin	7	Gen	882	5.6%	515	62.1%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	27.4%	69.5%	18.4%	9.3%	71.3%
129	DISTRICTWIDE TOTALS			33,142	9.2%	12,804	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.3%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%	11.6%	41.3%
130	BY RACE															
131																
134	TOP THIRD TOTALS			10,597	8.6%	2,513	26.0%	39.6%	51.3%	2.5%	5.3%	13.2%	89.0%	73.5%	10.8%	15.7%
137	MID THIRD TOTALS			10,444	10.7%	4,389	47.3%	22.4%	63.4%	2.0%	11.5%	27.3%	85.1%	44.3%	10.8%	44.8%
140	LOW THIRD TOTALS			11,942	8.5%	5,808	53.5%	4.5%	71.6%	1.2%	22.4%	34.3%	82.3%	26.2%	13.0%	60.9%
	SPECIAL SCHOOLS TOTALS			159	7.5%	94	66.3%	6.9%	61.0%	0.0%	30.2%	71.8%	22.6%	3.8%	22.6%	73.6%

PERCENT OF RACE IN EACH THIRD OF CLASS	Top Third	59.2%	26.5%	30.3%	42.7%
	Mid Third	33.0%	31.9%	45.5%	34.4%
	Low Third	7.6%	41.2%	21.2%	22.9%
	Spec. Sch.	0.2%	0.5%	3.0%	0.0%

The Dropout Rate for the 21 schools with the highest proportions of entrants reading at or above normal levels was 26%, while the rate for the mid-range schools was 47%, and that of the lowest schools was 54%. Not surprisingly, only three of the 21 schools with the most well-prepared students had more than 15% of their entering students overage (Bogan - 19%, Washington - 20%, and Simeon Vocational - 20%).

At the other end of the scale, seven schools had fewer than a quarter of their entering students with normal or above reading scores. However, Graduation Rates at all of these schools exceeded the proportion of normally reading entrants by at least 19 percentage points. In fact, the Graduation Rate at each of the schools in the lowest third (ranked by proportion with normal reading scores) exceeded the normal reading rate by at least 10 percentage points! Thus the schools receiving the most poorly prepared students seem to do more with those students than do the schools receiving the highest proportion of adequately prepared students. Some of these lowest schools did quite well, considering the preparation of the students they received. Though only one received more than a third of its students at normal reading rates, Senn (58%), Harrison - before it closed (53%), Bowen (52%), Orr (52%), and Collins (52%), all graduated more students than dropped out.

Several other schools had Graduation Rates below their normal reading rates: Hubbard (-8%), Roosevelt (-2%), Schurz (-1%), Kelly (-3%), Robeson (-1%), and Crane (-2%). All these schools but Hubbard were in the mid-range of the normal reading rates (between 36% and 57% of the entering class with normal or above reading scores)

Other schools which did significantly better than their normal reading rates (17 points higher) were Hirsch, Flower, Harlan, Sullivan, and Young.

Fifty-nine percent of all White students enrolled in the 21 schools with the highest proportion of normal reading rates, while only 27% of Blacks were in these schools; 43% of all Hispanics were in these schools. Only 7% of Whites, 23% of Hispanics, and 21% of all Asians were enrolled in the lowest third of schools ranked by reading scores. These last two groups also had high proportions of students without any recorded reading scores (students with limited English proficiency are not tested on English reading). However, the largest proportion of Black students (41%) were enrolled in those schools which received the most poorly prepared students. In fact, 12 of these schools were all Black, and four others were majority Black. Four were majority Hispanic (Juarez, Clemente, Wells, and Harrison).

While these comments relate 8th grade reading scores to eventual Graduate/Dropout Rates, no conclusion is available on the reading rates of graduates of these schools.

4. RACE

A. Whites

White students entering high school in 1978 overwhelmingly entered schools with other White students. 65% of all White students went to schools whose entering class was more than 60% White. Further, these Whites predominantly encountered Hispanics and Asians in the minority population in their schools. In only three of these 23 schools did Blacks outnumber Hispanics and Asians.

Dropout Rates in the heavily White schools were significantly lower than in the schools with few Whites. In the schools more than two-thirds White, more than two-thirds graduated, and almost that many graduated from the schools which were between one-third and two-thirds White in the entering class. In the schools less than a third White, the Dropout Rate rose to 46%. Schools with no Whites had a slightly higher Dropout Rate of 47%.

While most of the 11 schools with two-thirds White enrollments graduated over 65%, two (Kelly - 47%, and Roosevelt - just under 50%) had fewer Graduates than Dropouts. Amundsen (54%) Hubbard (60%), and Foreman (62%) were also below 65%. Foreman (20%), Amundsen (15%), and Roosevelt (14%) all had high Transfer Rates (students leaving the system).

Among the 11 schools with more than one-third White entering students, Lane (65% White) had an 84% Graduation Rate, and five others were above 65%. Lakeview (48%), had the lowest Graduation Rate. Among the schools with less than a third Whites entering, Young (81%) and Kenwood (80%) had high Graduation Rates.

The schools more than one-third White had fewer than 20% of their entering students overage, while schools with less than a third White entrants had more than a quarter of entering students overage. Only Amundsen (26%), Lakeview (26%), Kelvyn Park (30%), and Senn (33%) had more than a quarter overage, and the later three had significant numbers of Hispanics, among whom it is less unusual to begin high school overage. Some schools, with less than a third White entering students, had low levels of entering students overage: Metro (4%), Lindbloom (5%), Young (8%), Kenwood (10%), and CVS (10%).

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

STUDENT OUTCOMES
RANK ORDERED BY PERCENT WHITE

TABLE 12

RANK	UNIT	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED OWN SCH	PERCENT w/ NORMAL SCORES	PERCENT w/o SCORES	PERCENT BELOW NORM SCORES
1	1230	Bogan	15	Gen	300	10.8%	95.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	19.3%	96.7%	82.7%	9.7%	7.7%
2	1580	Taft	1	Gen	509	18.2%	91.0%	6.7%	0.6%	1.8%	8.5%	95.5%	79.0%	10.0%	11.0%
3	1330	Foreman	4	Gen	311	37.6%	85.5%	1.0%	0.6%	12.2%	22.5%	92.3%	56.9%	13.8%	29.3%
4	1670	Hubbard	15	Gen	341	40.4%	85.3%	2.5%	1.2%	9.7%	22.6%	93.5%	68.0%	11.1%	20.8%
5	1630	Washington	20	Gen	369	23.5%	83.5%	0.3%	0.8%	13.8%	19.8%	97.8%	71.0%	8.7%	20.3%
6	1560	Steinmetz	4	Gen	528	35.0%	76.1%	15.1%	4.0%	4.0%	18.5%	94.1%	57.4%	13.7%	28.8%
7	1210	Amundsen	2	Gen	398	45.7%	74.9%	4.0%	7.5%	10.6%	26.4%	89.7%	43.2%	21.4%	35.4%
8	1480	Mather	2	Gen	382	21.9%	74.3%	10.2%	11.5%	2.9%	14.9%	93.2%	71.2%	14.1%	14.7%
9	1420	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	29.5%	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	2.2%	16.8%	91.9%	69.5%	9.2%	21.4%
10	1400	Kelly	8	Gen	416	52.6%	73.1%	0.0%	1.0%	26.0%	22.4%	94.2%	49.8%	23.3%	26.9%
11	1520	Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	50.4%	67.8%	6.4%	9.2%	15.4%	20.9%	89.0%	52.2%	16.6%	31.3%
12	1440	Lane	3	Tech	882	15.9%	64.9%	12.1%	11.9%	10.8%	2.7%	90.2%	96.6%	3.2%	0.2%
13	1530	Schurz	4	Gen	940	48.9%	61.3%	3.7%	2.7%	30.6%	23.8%	90.3%	51.6%	10.7%	37.7%
14	1820	Curie	12	Gen	735	29.0%	57.3%	25.7%	1.1%	15.4%	15.6%	91.0%	57.1%	18.2%	24.6%
15	1070	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	22.9%	54.7%	22.0%	1.3%	21.2%	8.3%	88.1%	72.8%	24.4%	2.8%
16	1610	Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	30.8%	46.5%	22.8%	12.7%	17.3%	22.3%	91.6%	52.6%	13.3%	34.1%
17	1570	Sullivan	2	Gen	345	39.9%	43.7%	32.0%	9.5%	12.6%	22.5%	84.0%	48.0%	17.5%	34.5%
18	1430	Lakeview	3	Gen	452	52.1%	40.3%	11.1%	6.0%	41.2%	26.4%	83.6%	43.6%	17.0%	39.4%
19	1340	Gage Park	12	Gen	503	48.9%	38.9%	52.3%	0.8%	8.0%	18.3%	86.3%	40.8%	5.8%	53.5%
20	1540	Senn	2	Gen	597	42.4%	36.0%	19.6%	21.7%	21.7%	32.7%	84.1%	29.8%	30.2%	40.0%
21	1490	Morgan Park	18	Gen	469	27.1%	35.4%	63.1%	0.2%	0.6%	27.6%	92.5%	60.8%	4.7%	34.5%
22	1410	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	347	44.4%	34.0%	1.2%	1.7%	62.8%	30.3%	88.2%	39.2%	17.6%	43.2%
23	1810	Young	9	Gen	559	19.0%	27.5%	52.2%	5.5%	12.2%	7.9%	83.4%	63.1%	31.1%	5.7%
24	1110	Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	33.3%	26.4%	23.6%	0.0%	46.2%	19.8%	74.2%	56.0%	8.2%	35.7%
25	1800	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	40.0%	25.0%	64.6%	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%	87.5%	91.7%	2.1%	6.3%
26	1710	Kenwood	14	Gen	516	19.4%	17.8%	72.9%	2.7%	1.6%	9.5%	80.4%	70.3%	12.2%	17.4%
27	1640	Wells	6	Gen	569	55.6%	12.1%	25.8%	0.0%	61.7%	34.9%	84.5%	30.8%	18.5%	50.8%
28	1590	Tilden	13	Gen	563	51.8%	10.1%	75.7%	0.2%	13.9%	31.7%	86.0%	24.6%	8.5%	67.0%
29	1620	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	49.4%	8.8%	65.7%	0.7%	23.0%	28.9%	73.0%	36.5%	10.9%	52.6%
30	1840	Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	56.1%	7.3%	10.8%	0.6%	81.1%	30.6%	88.9%	26.3%	14.6%	59.0%
31	1890	Juarez	8	Gen	508	50.9%	4.7%	1.8%	0.0%	92.1%	46.8%	93.3%	25.0%	35.0%	40.0%
32	1370	Harrison +	8	Gen	322	47.3%	4.7%	37.3%	0.3%	57.1%	36.1%	81.1%	30.7%	16.5%	52.8%
33	1830	Orr	5	Gen	589	48.0%	3.1%	69.1%	0.8%	25.5%	30.5%	74.9%	21.7%	11.4%	66.9%
34	1260	Bowen	19	Gen	773	47.7%	1.7%	58.7%	0.1%	38.7%	32.5%	87.8%	30.9%	17.6%	51.5%
35	1020	Cregier Voc	9	Voc	217	54.8%	0.9%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	40.3%	63.6%	32.7%	7.4%	59.9%
36	1300	Farragut	10	Gen	569	55.3%	0.9%	76.4%	0.2%	22.5%	32.4%	79.3%	30.2%	9.5%	60.3%
37	1760	King, M.L.	14	Gen	454	50.2%	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	34.0%	83.5%	28.0%	9.9%	62.1%
38	1320	Robeson	16	Gen	658	57.4%	0.3%	99.5%	0.0%	0.0%	50.2%	84.5%	44.1%	7.4%	48.5%
39	1160	Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	433	22.1%	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	82.7%	85.0%	2.1%	12.9%
40	1310	Fenger	20	Gen	558	56.3%	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.7%	29.7%	86.2%	26.9%	10.8%	62.4%
41	1450	Lindblom	15	Tech	616	22.0%	0.2%	95.8%	3.7%	0.3%	4.9%	82.1%	81.3%	17.0%	1.6%
42	1350	Harlan	19	Gen	696	43.6%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	26.3%	85.2%	38.4%	8.5%	53.2%
43	1510	Phillips	11	Gen	858	57.4%	0.1%	99.5%	0.0%	0.3%	38.2%	85.5%	23.5%	5.9%	70.5%
44	1220	Austin	7	Gen	882	62.1%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	27.4%	69.5%	18.4%	9.9%	71.8%
45	1380	Hirsh	17	Gen	359	45.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.4%	77.7%	37.3%	6.7%	56.0%
46	1850	Carver	20	Gen	616	48.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	83.6%	45.1%	8.4%	46.4%
47	1860	Curtiss	20	Gen	621	33.6%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	86.6%	55.7%	3.9%	40.4%
48	1460	Manley	8	Gen	573	53.2%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	36.4%	80.3%	19.7%	7.0%	73.3%
49	1150	Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	34.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	86.0%	75.8%	5.8%	18.4%
50	1550	South Shore	17	Gen	723	53.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.1%	23.9%	83.8%	38.0%	10.7%	51.3%
51	1080	Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	42.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	[illegible]%	69.0%	38.0%	9.0%	53.0%
52	1250	Calumet	16	Gen	752	53.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	80.6%	36.3%	7.8%	55.9%
53	1010	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	27.1%	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.5%	9.5%	87.4%	85.3%	4.8%	9.9%
54	1680	Englewood	16	Voc	598	53.5%	0.0%	99.0%	0.0%	0.2%	40.2%	83.0%	34.8%	10.3%	54.9%
55	1880	Collins	8	Gen	440	48.1%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	79.8%	26.1%	9.3%	64.5%
56	1360	Harper	15	Gen	457	53.6%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	35.2%	74.8%	21.2%	7.0%	71.8%
57	1390	Hyde Park	14	Gen	728	37.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	84.7%	57.7%	6.8%	35.5%
58	1470	Marshall	9	Gen	546	57.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.0%	36.6%	77.7%	22.2%	9.5%	68.3%
59	1270	Crane	9	Gen	628	62.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.6%	82.0%	40.3%	9.2%	50.5%
60	1030	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	28.0%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	11.3%	89.1%	82.9%	5.9%	11.2%
61	1870	Julian	18	Gen	573	32.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	17.5%	89.2%	56.5%	5.9%	37.5%
62	1,90	DuSable	13	Gen	632	58.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	89.2%	27.7%	7.1%	66.2%
63	1040	Near No. Career Mags	3	Voc	87	59.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.4%	78.2%	27.6%	13.8%	58.6%
		SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,142	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%	11.6%	41.3%
		SCHOOLS TWO THIRDS WHITE			4,355	33.2%	79.6%	6.9%	3.5%	9.1%	19.0%	93.5%	63.3%	13.9%	22.8%
		SCHOOLS ONE THIRD WHITE			5,982	35.5%	49.5%	22.2%	6.4%	21.0%	19.8%	88.6%	56.5%	13.9%	29.7%
		LESS THAN A THIRD WHITE			11,911	47.2%	5.2%	70.2%	0.7%	23.2%	29.0%	82.6%	37.4%	13.1%	49.5%
		SCHOOLS WITHOUT WHITES			10,648	45.3%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.1%	26.6%	83.4%	46.8%	7.4%	45.8%
		SPECIAL SCHOOLS TOTALS			159	65.3%	6.9%	61.0%	0.0%	30.2%	71.8%	22.6%	3.8%	22.6%	73.6%
							Two Thirds	48.8%	1.5%	28.2%	28.5%				
							One Third	41.7%	6.4%	45.5%	61.8%				
							Third Less	8.8%	40.3%	18.2%	13.7%				
							None	0.0%	51.2%	9.1%	0.0%				
							Spec. Sch.	0.2%	0.5%	3.0%	0.0%				

Schools more than two-thirds white had 94% of their students remain for their whole high school career in the schools in which they originally enrolled. Students in schools more than a third White remained 89% of the time. Students at schools with less than a third White had higher levels of transfers.

Schools more than two-thirds White received 73% of their students with normal or above normal reading scores. Those with a third White had 56% with normal scores. Schools with less than a third White entering students had only 37% with normal reading scores, while those with no Whites had 47% with normal scores. The higher level of students with below normal or missing scores in the less than a third White schools is probably the result of the number of Hispanics in those schools without reading scores (students with limited proficiency in English who are not tested for English reading skills).

Among the schools which were two-thirds White, Bogan received 83% reading at or above normal rates. However, two schools (Amundsen - 57%, and Kelly - 50%) had more than half their entering students reading below normal rates or missing scores. Among the schools more than a third White, Lane had 97% of its students reading at or above normal rates, while seven schools had more below or without scores than at normal rates, with Senn (70%) and Kelvyn Park (61%) the worst. Among schools less than a third White, only Metro (92%), CVS (85%), Westinghouse (85%), Dunbar (83%), and Lindbloom (81%) had high levels of students entering with normal reading rates.

Dropout Rates for White students did not vary significantly for schools more than two-thirds White and those between one-third and two-thirds White (33% and 34% respectively). Whites in schools with less than a third White entrants drop out more frequently (48%). However, rates at individual schools vary significantly within each group. Among the predominantly White schools, Bogan had only 11% of its White students drop out and Taft only 17%. At the same time, Kelly (57%) and Roosevelt (52%) had more Whites drop out than graduate. Among schools one-third White, four had 16% of their Whites drop out. Three schools, all with 40% or fewer Whites, had more than half the Whites drop out (Lakeview - 61%, Gage Park - 54%, and Kelvyn Park - 50%). The Dropout Rate for all students at these three schools was lower than that for Whites - which was also the case at Kelly and Roosevelt. For the 8 schools between 1% and 12% White, Dropout Rates for Whites were all over 50%; one (Lincoln Park) was at 90% and four above 75% (Wells, Orr, Juarez, and Tilden).

DROP OUT STUDY-CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — RANK ORDER BY PERCENT WHITE — TABLE 13

School Level Data - Class of 1982

SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

RANK	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	WHITE ENROLLED	BLACK ENROLLED	AM IND ENROLLED	ASIAN ENROLLED	HISPANIC ENROLLED	WHITE DROPOUT RATE	BLACK DROPOUT RATE	ASIAN DROPOUT RATE	HISPANIC DROPOUT RATE	OVERALL DROPOUT RATE
1	Bogan	15	Gen	299	96.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	10.9%	ERR	0.0%	9.1%	10.8%
2	Taft	1	Gen	508	90.9%	6.7%	0.0%	0.6%	1.8%	17.1%	31.3%	0.0%	33.3%	18.2%
3	Hubbard	15	Gen	339	85.8%	2.9%	0.3%	1.2%	9.7%	39.4%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	40.3%
4	Foreman	4	Gen	310	85.8%	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%	12.3%	37.4%	0.0%	0.0%	46.7%	37.8%
5	Washington	20	Gen	364	84.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.8%	14.0%	22.6%	0.0%	33.3%	24.0%	23.1%
6	Steinmetz	4	Gen	519	76.7%	15.2%	0.0%	4.0%	4.0%	36.0%	34.2%	16.7%	33.3%	34.8%
7	Roundeen	2	Gen	388	76.5%	4.1%	0.8%	7.7%	10.8%	47.9%	61.5%	30.8%	29.4%	45.7%
8	Mather	2	Gen	378	75.1%	10.3%	0.0%	11.6%	2.9%	21.5%	38.9%	9.8%	22.2%	21.9%
9	Kelly *	8	Gen	412	73.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	25.7%	56.6%	ERR	25.0%	40.7%	52.6%
10	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	25.2%	41.7%	ERR	37.5%	29.5%
11	Roosevelt	1	Gen	432	68.3%	6.5%	0.5%	9.3%	15.5%	51.6%	57.1%	22.6%	54.5%	50.1%
12	Lane	3	Tech	881	64.9%	12.1%	0.2%	11.9%	10.8%	15.6%	21.2%	3.3%	25.3%	15.5%
13	Schurz	4	Gen	921	62.4%	3.8%	0.0%	2.7%	31.1%	48.4%	58.1%	13.0%	50.2%	48.3%
14	Curie	12	Gen	728	57.6%	25.8%	0.1%	1.1%	15.4%	22.9%	35.4%	14.3%	43.8%	29.1%
15	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	54.7%	22.0%	0.8%	1.3%	21.2%	27.5%	15.4%	0.0%	19.2%	22.9%
16	Von Steuben	1	Gen	343	46.6%	23.0%	0.0%	12.8%	17.5%	30.9%	34.7%	21.2%	31.0%	30.8%
17	Sullivan	2	Gen	319	44.5%	32.6%	0.3%	9.7%	12.9%	35.1%	43.5%	12.5%	26.6%	34.9%
18	Lakeview	3	Gen	448	40.4%	11.2%	0.9%	6.0%	41.5%	60.5%	59.0%	33.3%	44.4%	52.1%
19	Gage Park *	12	Gen	501	38.9%	52.3%	0.0%	0.8%	8.0%	54.1%	47.0%	25.0%	37.8%	48.7%
20	Morgan Park	18	Gen	464	35.8%	63.4%	0.0%	0.2%	0.6%	23.5%	28.4%	0.0%	66.7%	26.9%
21	Senn *	2	Gen	593	35.6%	19.4%	2.2%	21.4%	21.4%	42.3%	50.5%	38.5%	37.2%	42.3%
22	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	346	33.8%	1.2%	0.3%	1.7%	63.0%	50.0%	66.7%	16.7%	41.7%	44.4%
23	Young	9	Gen	543	28.4%	53.4%	0.0%	5.7%	12.5%	27.0%	14.7%	3.4%	23.8%	18.6%
24	Richards Voc	11	Voc	175	27.4%	24.6%	0.0%	0.0%	48.0%	42.2%	26.8%	ERR	29.9%	32.5%
25	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	25.0%	64.6%	2.1%	0.0%	8.3%	36.4%	41.4%	ERR	25.0%	40.0%
26	Kenwood	14	Gen	489	18.5%	76.9%	0.0%	2.9%	1.6%	6.7%	22.2%	16.7%	0.0%	18.9%
27	Wells	6	Gen	568	12.1%	25.9%	0.4%	0.0%	61.6%	78.9%	47.7%	ERR	54.8%	55.6%
28	Tilden	13	Gen	559	10.2%	75.7%	0.0%	0.2%	14.0%	77.1%	48.0%	100.0%	54.7%	51.7%
29	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	270	8.9%	66.3%	0.7%	0.7%	23.3%	89.5%	43.8%	0.0%	54.0%	49.2%
30	Clemente	6	Gen	1,056	7.4%	10.8%	0.1%	0.6%	81.2%	66.2%	55.1%	16.7%	55.7%	56.1%
31	Juarez	8	Gen	497	4.8%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	93.6%	77.8%	28.6%	ERR	49.4%	50.2%
32	Harrison *	8	Gen	319	4.7%	37.6%	0.0%	0.3%	57.4%	54.5%	41.1%	ERR	51.0%	47.1%
33	Orr	5	Gen	577	3.1%	70.0%	0.0%	0.9%	26.0%	78.6%	44.4%	33.3%	52.8%	47.3%
34	Bowen	19	Gen	764	1.7%	59.3%	0.0%	0.1%	38.9%	61.5%	52.4%	0.0%	39.8%	47.7%
35	Crosier Voc	9	Voc	216	0.9%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.3%	ERR	ERR	54.8%
36	Farragut	10	Gen	564	0.9%	76.2%	0.0%	0.2%	22.7%	50.0%	53.6%	0.0%	61.7%	55.3%
37	King, M.L.	14	Gen	453	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.6%	ERR	ERR	50.2%
38	Robeson	16	Gen	653	0.3%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	57.3%	ERR	ERR	57.3%
39	Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	431	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	ERR	ERR	22.1%
40	Fenger	20	Gen	558	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	56.2%	ERR	100.0%	56.3%
41	Lindblom	15	Tech	614	0.2%	95.8%	0.0%	3.7%	0.3%	0.0%	22.0%	19.0%	100.0%	22.0%
42	Harlan	19	Gen	692	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	43.5%	ERR	100.0%	43.6%
43	Phillips	11	Gen	849	0.1%	99.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	100.0%	57.4%	ERR	50.0%	57.4%
44	Austin *	7	Gen	878	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	100.0%	62.0%	ERR	100.0%	62.1%
45	Crane	9	Gen	587	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	62.6%	ERR	ERR	62.6%
46	Marshall	9	Gen	542	0.0%	99.8%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	57.2%	ERR	ERR	57.3%
47	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,029	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	ERR	27.1%	ERR	40.0%	27.1%
48	Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	34.1%	ERR	ERR	34.1%
49	Hirsh	17	Gen	359	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	45.7%	ERR	ERR	45.7%
50	Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	86	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	59.7%	ERR	ERR	59.7%
51	Manley	8	Gen	568	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	53.2%	ERR	ERR	53.2%
52	Flower Voc	7	Voc	199	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	42.6%	ERR	ERR	42.6%
53	DuSable	13	Gen	627	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	58.4%	ERR	ERR	58.4%
54	Carver	20	Gen	613	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	48.4%	ERR	ERR	48.4%
55	Calumet	16	Gen	749	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	53.4%	ERR	ERR	53.4%
56	Corliss	20	Gen	613	0.0%	99.8%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	33.5%	ERR	ERR	33.5%
57	Harper	15	Gen	455	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	53.5%	ERR	100.0%	53.6%
58	Julian	18	Gen	572	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	32.5%	ERR	0.0%	32.5%
59	South Shore	17	Gen	719	0.0%	99.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	ERR	53.2%	ERR	0.0%	53.2%
60	Englewood	16	Gen	580	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	53.0%	ERR	100.0%	53.1%
61	Hyde Park	14	Gen	722	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	37.6%	ERR	ERR	37.6%
62	Collins	8	Gen	439	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	48.1%	ERR	ERR	48.1%
63	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	607	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	28.0%	ERR	0.0%	27.9%
	SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			32,810	21.6%	62.8%	0.1%	1.9%	13.6%	34.6%	45.1%	19.4%	46.9%	42.7%

AVE CLASS							
392	SCHOOLS TWO-THIRDS WHITE	4,319	80.1%	7.0%	0.2%	3.5%	9.2%	32.5%	39.7%	19.5%	38.5%	33.2%
539	SCHOOLS ONE-THIRD WHITE	5,930	49.7%	22.3%	0.4%	6.5%	21.1%	34.3%	36.9%	20.8%	40.1%	35.4%
518	SCHOOLS LESS THAN A THIRD WHITE	10,895	5.7%	68.3%	0.1%	0.8%	25.2%	47.5%	44.4%	13.2%	50.7%	45.9%
571	SCHOOLS WITH NO WHITES	11,428	.0%	99.9%	.0%	0.0%	0.1%	100.0%	46.6%	ERR	50.0%	46.6%

PERCENT OF RACE IN EACH GROUPING	Two-thirds White	48.9%	1.5%	18.6%	24.5%	8.9%
	One-third White	41.7%	6.4%	58.1%	61.8%	28.0%
	Less than a third	8.8%	36.1%	14.0%	13.7%	61.6%
	No Whites	.0%	55.4%	7.0%	0.0%	0.3%

Minorities attending predominantly White schools do better than members of their race systemwide. The Black Dropout Rate at these schools was 40% (7% higher than for Whites), compared with 45% systemwide; Hispanics were at 39%, compared with 47% systemwide. Black Dropout Rates were lower (37%) at schools one-third White (versus White rates of 34%), but Hispanic rates increased to 40%. Among schools less than a third White, Dropout Rates for all these groups increased: Whites - 48%, Blacks - 44%, and Hispanics, 46%. Black and Hispanic rates were 47% and 50% at all minority schools. Thus, Hispanics and Blacks clearly do better at schools with at least a third White students. Black and Hispanic Dropout Rates were lowest at Prosser Vocational (15% and 19% respectively), lower than the White rate (28%) and the overall Dropout Rate (23%).

Whites (11%) transferred out of the Chicago Public School system more than Blacks (7%) but less than Hispanics (14%). The overall Transfer Rate is 9%. Generally, as the proportion of Whites decreased, the Transfer Rate increased. For schools over two-thirds White, the Transfer Rate was 10%; for one-third White schools, 12%; for less than a third White, 14%. Among schools with more than 10% Whites, the highest Transfer Rates for Whites were at Sullivan (45% White, Transfer Rate 22%), Foreman (86% White, Transfer Rate 20%), Kenwood (19% White, Transfers 18%), and Wells (12% White, Transfers 17%). Lincoln Park (21%), Juarez (25%), Harrison (27%), and Orr (22%) had between 3% and 10% White entering students and high Transfer Rates among those few White students. Only Clemente (9%) had a low White Transfer Rate in this group. Hispanic Transfer Rates were generally higher than White Transfer Rates, particularly in schools more than a third White. Hispanic Transfer Rates were highest at Sullivan (32%), Von Steuben (30%), and Foreman (21%). Black Transfer Rates were generally lower than White rates.

B. BLACKS

Black students, like White students, overwhelmingly entered high school with members of their own race. Three-fourths (76%) went to schools in which the entering class was more than 95% Black. Another 15% went to majority Black schools; only 9% went to schools in which the entering class was not majority Black. In 6 of the 25 schools with less than a majority of Black entering students, Hispanics were the largest racial group; at the other 19, Whites predominated.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

STUDENT OUTCOMES
RANK ORDERED BY PERCENT BLACK

TABLE 14

RANK	UNIT #SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED w/ ORIG SCH	PERCENT NORMAL SCORES	PERCENT w/o SCORES	PERCENT BELOW NORM SCORES
1	1850 Carver	20	Gen	616	48.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	83.6%	45.1%	8.4%	46.4%
2	1390 Hyde Park	14	Gen	724	37.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	84.7%	57.7%	6.4%	35.9%
3	1250 Calumet	16	Gen	752	53.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	80.6%	36.3%	7.8%	55.9%
4	1150 Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	34.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	86.0%	75.8%	5.8%	18.4%
5	1380 Hirsh	17	Gen	359	45.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.4%	77.7%	37.3%	6.7%	56.0%
6	1270 Crane	9	Gen	628	62.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.6%	82.0%	40.3%	9.2%	50.5%
7	1040 Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	42.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%	69.0%	38.0%	9.0%	53.0%
8	1050 Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	87	59.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.4%	78.2%	27.6%	13.8%	58.6%
9	1280 DuSable	13	Gen	632	58.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	89.2%	27.7%	7.1%	65.2%
10	1870 Julian	18	Gen	573	32.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	17.5%	89.2%	56.5%	5.9%	37.5%
11	1460 Manley	8	Gen	573	53.2%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	36.4%	80.3%	19.7%	7.0%	73.3%
12	1360 Harper	15	Gen	457	53.6%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	35.2%	74.8%	21.2%	7.0%	71.8%
13	1880 Collins	8	Gen	440	48.1%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	79.8%	26.1%	9.3%	64.5%
14	1160 Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	433	22.1%	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	82.7%	85.0%	2.1%	12.9%
15	1350 Harlan	19	Gen	696	43.6%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	26.3%	85.2%	38.4%	8.5%	53.2%
16	1860 Corliss	20	Gen	621	33.6%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	86.6%	55.7%	3.9%	40.4%
17	1030 Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	28.0%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	11.3%	89.1%	82.9%	5.9%	11.2%
18	1220 Austin	7	Gen	882	62.1%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	27.4%	69.5%	18.4%	9.9%	71.8%
19	1470 Marshall	9	Gen	546	57.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.0%	36.6%	77.7%	22.2%	9.5%	68.3%
20	1550 South Shore	17	Gen	723	53.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.1%	23.9%	83.8%	38.0%	10.7%	51.3%
21	1320 Robeson	16	Gen	658	57.4%	0.3%	99.5%	0.0%	0.0%	50.2%	84.5%	44.1%	7.4%	48.5%
22	1510 Phillips	11	Gen	858	57.7%	0.1%	99.5%	0.0%	0.3%	38.2%	85.5%	23.5%	5.9%	70.5%
23	1010 Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	27.1%	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.5%	9.5%	87.4%	85.3%	4.8%	9.9%
24	1760 King,M.L.	14	Gen	458	50.2%	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	34.0%	83.5%	28.0%	9.5%	62.1%
25	1310 Fenger	20	Gen	558	56.3%	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.7%	29.7%	86.2%	26.9%	10.8%	62.4%
26	1020 Crosier Voc	9	Voc	217	54.8%	0.9%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	40.3%	63.6%	32.7%	7.4%	59.9%
27	1680 Englewood	16	Gen	594	53.5%	0.0%	99.0%	0.0%	0.2%	40.2%	83.0%	34.8%	10.3%	54.9%
28	1450 Lindblom	15	Tech	616	22.0%	0.2%	95.8%	3.7%	0.3%	4.9%	82.1%	81.3%	17.0%	1.6%
29	1300 Farragut	10	Gen	569	55.3%	0.9%	76.4%	0.2%	22.5%	32.4%	79.3%	30.2%	9.5%	60.3%
30	1590 Tilden	13	Gen	563	51.8%	10.1%	75.7%	0.2%	13.9%	31.7%	86.0%	28.6%	8.5%	67.0%
31	1710 Kenwood	14	Gen	516	19.4%	17.8%	72.9%	2.7%	1.6%	9.5%	80.4%	70.3%	12.2%	17.4%
32	1830 Orr	5	Gen	589	48.0%	3.1%	69.1%	0.8%	25.5%	30.5%	74.9%	21.7%	11.4%	66.9%
33	1620 Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	49.4%	8.8%	65.7%	0.7%	23.0%	28.9%	73.0%	36.5%	10.9%	52.6%
34	1800 Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	40.0%	25.0%	64.6%	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%	87.5%	91.7%	2.1%	6.3%
35	1490 Morgan Park	18	Gen	469	27.1%	35.4%	63.1%	0.2%	0.6%	27.6%	92.5%	60.8%	4.7%	34.5%
36	1240 Bowen	19	Gen	773	47.7%	1.7%	58.7%	0.1%	38.7%	32.5%	87.8%	30.9%	17.6%	51.5%
37	1340 Cage Park	12	Gen	503	48.9%	38.9%	52.3%	0.8%	8.0%	18.3%	86.3%	40.8%	5.8%	53.5%
38	1810 Young	9	Gen	559	19.0%	27.5%	52.2%	5.5%	12.2%	7.5%	83.4%	63.1%	31.1%	5.7%
39	1370 Harrison +	8	Gen	322	47.3%	4.7%	37.3%	0.3%	57.1%	36.1%	81.1%	30.7%	16.5%	52.8%
40	1570 Sullivan	2	Gen	325	34.9%	43.7%	32.0%	9.5%	12.6%	22.5%	84.0%	48.0%	17.5%	34.5%
41	1640 Wells	6	Gen	569	55.6%	12.1%	25.8%	0.0%	61.7%	34.9%	84.5%	30.8%	18.5%	50.8%
42	1820 Curie	12	Gen	735	29.0%	57.3%	25.7%	1.1%	15.4%	15.6%	91.0%	57.1%	18.2%	24.6%
43	1420 Kennedy	12	Gen	370	29.5%	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	2.2%	16.8%	91.9%	69.5%	9.2%	21.4%
44	1110 Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	33.3%	26.4%	23.6%	0.0%	46.2%	19.8%	74.2%	56.0%	8.2%	35.7%
45	1610 Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	30.8%	46.5%	22.8%	12.7%	17.3%	22.3%	91.6%	52.6%	13.3%	34.1%
46	1070 Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	22.9%	54.7%	22.0%	1.3%	21.2%	8.3%	88.1%	72.8%	24.4%	2.8%
47	1540 Senn	2	Gen	597	42.4%	36.0%	19.6%	21.7%	21.7%	32.7%	84.1%	29.8%	30.2%	40.0%
48	1560 Steinmetz	4	Gen	524	35.0%	76.1%	15.1%	4.0%	4.0%	18.5%	94.1%	57.4%	13.7%	28.8%
49	1440 Lane	3	Tech	882	15.9%	64.9%	12.1%	11.9%	10.8%	2.7%	90.2%	96.6%	3.2%	0.2%
50	1430 Lakeview	3	Gen	452	52.1%	40.3%	11.1%	6.0%	41.2%	26.4%	83.6%	43.6%	17.0%	39.4%
51	1840 Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	56.1%	7.3%	10.8%	0.6%	81.1%	30.6%	88.9%	26.3%	14.6%	59.0%
52	1480 Mather	2	Gen	382	21.9%	74.3%	10.2%	11.5%	2.9%	14.9%	93.2%	71.2%	14.1%	14.7%
53	1580 Taft	1	Gen	509	18.2%	91.0%	6.7%	0.6%	1.8%	8.5%	95.9%	79.0%	10.0%	11.0%
54	1520 Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	50.4%	67.8%	6.4%	9.2%	15.4%	20.9%	89.0%	52.2%	16.6%	31.3%
55	1210 Amundsen	2	Gen	398	35.7%	74.9%	4.0%	7.5%	10.6%	26.4%	89.7%	43.2%	21.4%	35.4%
56	1530 Schurz	4	Gen	980	48.9%	61.3%	3.7%	2.7%	30.6%	23.8%	90.3%	51.6%	10.7%	37.7%
57	1670 Hubbard	15	Gen	341	40.4%	85.3%	2.9%	1.2%	9.7%	22.6%	93.5%	68.0%	11.1%	20.8%
58	1890 Juarez	8	Gen	508	50.9%	4.7%	1.8%	0.0%	92.1%	46.8%	93.3%	25.0%	35.0%	40.0%
59	1410 Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	347	44.4%	34.0%	1.2%	1.7%	62.8%	30.3%	88.2%	39.2%	17.6%	43.2%
60	1330 Foreman	4	Gen	311	37.6%	86.5%	1.0%	0.6%	12.2%	22.5%	92.3%	56.9%	13.8%	29.3%
61	1630 Washington	20	Gen	369	23.5%	83.5%	0.3%	0.8%	13.8%	19.8%	97.8%	71.0%	8.7%	20.3%
62	1400 Kelly	8	Gen	416	52.6%	73.1%	0.0%	1.0%	26.0%	22.4%	94.2%	49.8%	23.3%	26.9%
63	1230 Bogan	15	Gen	300	10.8%	95.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	19.3%	96.7%	82.7%	9.7%	7.7%
	SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,142	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%	11.6%	41.3%
	SCHOOLS 95% BLACK			16,020	46.4%	0.1%	99.5%	0.1%	0.1%	27.5%	82.6%	44.4%	7.9%	47.6%
	SCHOOLS 50% - 94% BLACK			4,863	41.1%	15.1%	65.0%	1.2%	17.3%	24.5%	83.2%	41.7%	12.8%	45.5%
	SCHOOLS 10% - 49% BLACK			7,139	36.9%	43.0%	19.1%	5.9%	31.3%	21.4%	88.1%	52.6%	15.5%	32.0%
	SCHOOLS LESS THAN 10% BLACK			4,874	39.8%	66.3%	2.9%	2.4%	27.4%	24.1%	92.5%	54.9%	16.1%	29.0%
	SPECIAL SCHOOLS TOTALS			159	65.3%	6.9%	61.0%	0.0%	30.2%	71.8%	22.6%	3.8%	22.6%	73.6%

95% Black	0.2%	76.9%	9.1%	3.7%
50% Black	10.4%	15.2%	9.1%	9.7%
10% Black	43.2%	6.0%	51.5%	67.6%
Less	0.0%	0.7%	27.3%	19.0%

Dropout Rates were higher in all Black (46%) and majority Black (41%) schools than in schools with between 10% and 49% Blacks (36%). The Dropout Rate in schools with less than 10% entering Blacks was 40%. However, Dropout Rates varied significantly among all Black and majority Black schools. Some all Black schools had quite low Dropout Rates: Lindbloom Tech. (22%), Westinghouse (22%), CVS (27%), and Dunbar Vocational (28%). However, a majority of the all Black schools (15 of 28) had more students drop out than graduate. The worst Dropout Rates were at Crane (63%) and Austin (62%). Among the majority Black schools, Young (19%), Kenwood (19%), and Morgan Park (27%), had low Dropout Rates. Two schools, Farragut (55%) and Tilden (52%), had more drop out than graduated.

Surprisingly, overage statistics varied only moderately between all Black, majority Black, and minority Black schools (28%, 25%, and 20% respectively). But individual schools varied dramatically. All Black schools go from half of the entering class being overage (Robeson, 50%) to less than 5% overage (Lindbloom). Cregier Vocational and Englewood (both at 40%) also had very high proportions of overage entrants. CVS (10%), Dunbar Vocational (11%), Westinghouse Vocational (13%), Corliss (15%), Hyde Park (16%), Julian (18%), and Flower Vocational (19%) all had low numbers of overage entrants among the all Black schools. None of the majority Black schools had more than a third of entering students overage. Four had low proportions of overage entrants: Metro (4%), Young (8%), Kenwood (10%), and Gage Park (18%).

Transfers within the Chicago system were much more common in all Black and majority Black schools (18%) than in schools with few (12%) or no Blacks (7%). At some schools, nearly one of three students transferred to another Chicago Public School: Cregier Vocational (36%), Flower Vocational (31%), and Austin (30%). On the other hand, some majority Black schools had relatively few transfers: Morgan Park (7%), Julian (10%), and Dunbar Vocational (10%).

All Black (56%) and majority Black (50%) schools received more than half their students with below normal or missing reading scores. At schools in which Blacks were a minority, this rate fell to 47%; and in schools with less than 10% Black, the rate was 45%. However, within these groups, schools varied widely. Among the all Black and majority Black schools, Metro received 92% reading at or above normal rates, and CVS (85%), Westinghouse Vocational (85%), Dunbar Vocational (83%), and Lindbloom (81%) also did well. But seven schools had more than three-fourths of their students reading below normal levels or missing scores: Austin (82%), Manley (80%), Harper (79%), Orr (78%), Marshall (78%), Phillips (77%), and Tilden (75%).

DROP OUT STUDY-CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

RANK ORDER BY PERCENT BLACK

TABLE 15

RANK	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	WHITE ENROLLED	BLACK ENROLLED	ASIAN ENROLLED	HISPANIC ENROLLED	WHITE DROPOUT RATE	BLACK DROPOUT RATE	ASIAN DROPOUT RATE	HISPANIC DROPOUT RATE	OVERALL DROPOUT RATE
1	Crane	9	Gen	587	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	62.6%	ERR	ERR	62.6%
2	Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	86	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	59.7%	ERR	ERR	59.7%
3	DuSable	13	Gen	627	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	58.4%	ERR	ERR	58.4%
4	Calumet	16	Gen	749	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	53.4%	ERR	ERR	53.4%
5	Carver	20	Gen	613	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	48.4%	ERR	ERR	48.4%
6	Collins	8	Gen	439	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	48.1%	ERR	ERR	48.1%
7	Hirsh	17	Gen	359	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	45.7%	ERR	ERR	45.7%
8	Flower Voc	7	Voc	199	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	42.6%	ERR	ERR	42.6%
9	Hyde Park	14	Gen	722	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	37.6%	ERR	ERR	37.6%
10	Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	34.1%	ERR	ERR	34.1%
11	Corliss	20	Gen	613	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	33.5%	ERR	ERR	33.5%
12	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	607	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	28.0%	ERR	0.0%	27.9%
13	Englewood	16	Gen	580	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	53.0%	ERR	100.0%	53.1%
14	Julian	18	Gen	572	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	32.5%	ERR	0.0%	32.5%
15	Manley	8	Gen	568	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	53.2%	ERR	ERR	53.2%
16	Marshall	9	Gen	542	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	57.2%	ERR	ERR	57.3%
17	Harper	15	Gen	455	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	53.5%	ERR	100.0%	53.6%
18	Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	431	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	ERR	ERR	22.1%
19	South Shore	17	Gen	719	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	ERR	53.2%	ERR	0.0%	53.2%
20	Harlan	19	Gen	692	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	43.5%	ERR	100.0%	43.6%
21	Robeson	16	Gen	653	0.3%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	57.3%	ERR	ERR	57.3%
22	Austin	7	Gen	878	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	100.0%	62.0%	ERR	100.0%	62.1%
23	Phillips	11	Gen	849	0.1%	99.6%	0.0%	0.2%	100.0%	57.4%	ERR	50.0%	57.4%
24	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,029	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.5%	ERR	27.1%	ERR	40.0%	27.1%
25	King,M.L.	14	Gen	453	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.6%	ERR	ERR	50.2%
26	Fenger	20	Gen	558	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	56.2%	ERR	100.0%	56.3%
27	Crozier Voc	9	Voc	216	0.9%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.3%	ERR	ERR	54.8%
28	Lindblom	15	Tech	614	0.2%	95.8%	3.7%	0.3%	0.0%	22.0%	19.0%	100.0%	22.0%
29	Kenwood	14	Gen	489	18.6%	76.9%	2.9%	1.6%	6.7%	22.2%	16.7%	0.0%	18.9%
30	Farragut	10	Gen	564	0.9%	76.2%	0.2%	22.7%	50.0%	53.6%	0.0%	61.7%	55.3%
31	Tilden	13	Gen	559	10.2%	75.7%	0.2%	14.0%	77.1%	48.0%	100.0%	54.7%	51.7%
32	Orr	5	Gen	577	3.1%	70.0%	0.9%	26.0%	78.6%	44.4%	33.3%	52.8%	47.3%
33	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	270	8.9%	66.3%	0.7%	23.3%	89.5%	43.8%	0.0%	54.0%	49.2%
34	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	25.0%	64.6%	0.0%	9.3%	36.4%	41.4%	ERR	25.0%	40.0%
35	Morgan Park	18	Gen	468	35.8%	63.4%	0.2%	0.6%	23.5%	28.4%	0.0%	66.7%	26.9%
36	Bowen	19	Gen	764	1.7%	59.3%	0.1%	38.9%	61.5%	52.4%	0.0%	39.8%	47.7%
37	Young	9	Gen	543	28.4%	53.4%	5.7%	12.5%	27.0%	14.7%	3.4%	23.8%	18.6%
38	Gage Park	12	Gen	501	38.9%	52.3%	0.8%	8.0%	54.1%	47.0%	25.0%	37.8%	48.7%
39	Harrison +	8	Gen	319	4.7%	37.6%	0.3%	57.4%	54.5%	41.1%	ERR	51.0%	47.1%
40	Sullivan	2	Gen	319	44.5%	32.6%	9.7%	12.9%	35.1%	43.5%	12.5%	28.6%	34.9%
41	Wells	6	Gen	568	12.1%	25.9%	0.0%	61.6%	78.9%	47.7%	ERR	54.8%	55.6%
42	Curie	12	Gen	728	57.6%	25.8%	1.1%	15.4%	22.5%	35.4%	14.3%	43.8%	29.1%
43	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	2.2%	25.2%	41.7%	ERR	37.5%	29.5%
44	Richards Voc	11	Voc	175	27.4%	24.6%	0.0%	48.0%	42.2%	26.8%	ERR	29.9%	32.5%
45	Von Steuben	1	Gen	343	46.6%	23.0%	12.8%	17.5%	30.9%	34.7%	21.2%	31.0%	30.8%
46	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	54.7%	22.0%	1.3%	21.2%	27.5%	15.4%	0.0%	19.2%	22.9%
47	Senn	2	Gen	593	35.6%	19.4%	21.4%	21.4%	42.3%	50.5%	38.5%	37.2%	42.3%
48	Steinmetz	4	Gen	519	76.7%	15.2%	4.0%	4.0%	36.0%	34.2%	16.7%	33.3%	34.8%
49	Lane	3	Tech	881	64.9%	12.1%	11.9%	10.8%	15.6%	21.2%	3.3%	25.3%	15.9%
50	Lakeview	3	Gen	448	40.4%	11.2%	6.0%	41.5%	60.5%	59.0%	33.3%	44.4%	52.1%
51	Clemente	6	Gen	1,056	7.4%	10.8%	0.6%	81.2%	66.2%	55.1%	16.7%	55.7%	56.1%
52	Mather	2	Gen	378	75.1%	10.3%	11.6%	2.9%	21.5%	38.9%	9.8%	22.2%	21.9%
53	Taft	1	Gen	508	90.9%	6.7%	0.6%	1.8%	17.1%	31.3%	0.0%	33.3%	18.2%
54	Roosevelt	1	Gen	432	68.3%	6.5%	9.3%	15.5%	51.6%	57.1%	22.6%	54.5%	50.1%
55	Amundsen	2	Gen	388	76.5%	4.1%	7.7%	10.8%	47.9%	61.5%	30.8%	29.4%	45.7%
56	Schurz	4	Gen	921	62.4%	3.8%	2.7%	31.1%	48.4%	58.1%	13.0%	50.2%	48.3%
57	Hubbard	15	Gen	339	85.8%	2.9%	1.2%	9.7%	39.4%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	40.3%
58	Juarez	8	Gen	497	4.8%	1.6%	0.0%	93.6%	77.8%	28.6%	ERR	49.4%	50.2%
59	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	346	33.8%	1.2%	1.7%	63.0%	50.0%	66.7%	16.7%	41.7%	44.4%
60	Foreman	4	Gen	310	85.8%	1.0%	0.6%	12.3%	37.4%	0.0%	0.0%	46.7%	37.8%
61	Washington	20	Gen	364	84.6%	0.3%	0.8%	14.0%	22.6%	0.0%	33.3%	28.0%	23.1%
62	Bogan	15	Gen	299	96.0%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	10.9%	ERR	0.0%	9.1%	10.8%
63	Kelly	8	Gen	412	73.3%	0.0%	1.0%	25.7%	56.6%	ERR	25.0%	40.7%	52.6%
	SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			32,810	21.6%	62.8%	1.9%	13.6%	34.6%	45.1%	19.4%	46.9%	42.7%
AVE CLASS													
567	SCHOOLS 95+% BLACK			15,894	0.1%	99.6%	0.1%	0.1%	18.2%	46.4%	19.0%	61.1%	46.4%
477	SCHOOLS 50% - 94% BLACK			4,779	15.4%	66.7%	1.3%	17.6%	38.8%	40.7%	11.1%	46.0%	41.0%
505	SCHOOLS 10% - 49% BLACK			7,083	43.2%	19.2%	5.9%	31.3%	30.7%	39.2%	19.8%	47.3%	36.3%
437	SCHOOLS LESS THAN 10% BLACK			4,816	66.9%	2.9%	2.5%	27.5%	37.3%	46.5%	22.3%	45.6%	39.5%

PERCENT OF RACE IN EACH GROUPING	95+% Black	0.2%	76.8%	3.7%	0.5%
	50% - 94% Black	10.4%	15.2%	9.7%	18.8%
	10% - 49% Black	43.2%	6.6%	67.6%	49.7%
	Under 10% Black	45.5%	0.7%	19.0%	29.8%

Thus, the picture that emerges is that there are two, quite different, types of all Black or majority Black schools. Some received well prepared students, few of whom were overage (Metro, CVS, Westinghouse Vocational, Dunbar Vocational, Lindbloom Tech.). Close behind were schools like Simeon Vocational (76% normal or above but only 20% overage) and Kenwood (70% normal, 10% overage). Except for Metro (60%) and Simeon (66%), all of these schools graduated more than 70% of their students. Quite different were schools like Austin, Manley, Harper, Orr, Marshall, Phillips and Tilden, all of which received more than three-fourths of their students unprepared for high school level work. 19 other schools had less than half their entering students reading at normal or above rates. Thus 26 of 38 all Black or majority Black schools started out with a majority of their students unprepared for high school work, and with more than half of these students already overage. Five other schools (Young - 63%, Morgan Park - 61%, Hyde Park - 58%, Julian - 56%, and Corliss - 56%) had between half and two-thirds of their students adequately prepared. Among the 25 schools in which Blacks were a minority, only 10 have more than half their students enter with below normal or missing scores, and five of these schools had large Hispanic populations. Six of the 25 have more than 70% at or above normal reading scores.

Black Dropout Rates were highest in all Black schools (46%) and in schools with virtually no Blacks (47%). Only small differences existed in majority Black and minority Black schools (41% vs. 39%). But, as already noted, Dropout Rates among individual all Black schools and majority Black schools varied significantly. At the all Black schools, the overall Dropout Rate and the Dropout Rate for Blacks was obviously identical. Thus, Lindbloom (22%), Westinghouse Vocational (22%), CVS (27%), and Dunbar Vocational (28%) all have low rates. Fifteen schools had more Dropouts than Graduates. However, in majority Black schools, Black and Overall Dropout Rates diverged. In most of these schools, Black Dropout Rates were lower than the overall rates when Hispanics, rather than Whites, were the next largest group. When Whites were the next largest group, Black rates were usually higher than the overall rates. However, at Bowen (59% Black, 39% Hispanic) the Dropout Rate for Blacks was 12 points higher than for Hispanics (52% vs. 40%). In the aggregate, White Dropout Rates were two points lower than Black rates, but at half the schools, Black rates were lower than White rates, often by a large margin (e.g., Tilden by 29 points, Lincoln Park by 46 points, and Gage Park by 7 percentage points). In schools in which Blacks were a minority, Blacks generally do better than the systemwide average (45% for Blacks), and quite well at Prosser Vocational (15%) and Lane (21%). In schools with less than 10% Black entrants, Dropout rates varied from 29% (Juarez) to 67% (Kelvyn Park).

The Transfer Rate (out of the Chicago system) was quite low (7%) in all Black schools, but Robeson (16%) stands out from the rest. Among majority Black schools, only Kenwood had a high Black Transfer Rate (14%). But Whites and Hispanics had high rates at a number of these schools: Orr (White - 22%, Hispanic - 17%), Lincoln Park (White - 21%, Hispanic - 21%), Kenwood (White - 18%, Hispanic - 13%), and Tilden (White - 16%, Hispanic - 18%). Black Transfer Rates in minority Black schools were high only at Lakeview (22%) and Sullivan (18%, but White - 22%, and Hispanic - 32%, rates were even higher).

C. Hispanics

Half of all Hispanic students went to school in the five schools which were majority Hispanic in the 1978 entering freshman class. A fourth went to schools between 25% and 49% Hispanic, and a fourth went to schools whose entering classes were 5% to 24% Hispanic. Thus, Hispanics attended school with members of other racial groups more than either Whites or Blacks. 98% of all Hispanics were enrolled in only 28 of the system's 63 regular high schools.

The Dropout Rate progressively declined with the declining concentration of Hispanic students. More than half (53%) of all students attending majority Hispanic schools dropped out, while just under half (48%) of students in schools more than 25% Hispanic did. Only 36% dropped out from schools 5% to 24% Hispanic; but schools with less than 5% Hispanics, which enrolled 58% of all students in the system, equalled the systemwide Dropout Rate of 43%. Among the five majority Hispanic schools, three (Clemente - 56%, Wells - 56%, and Juarez - 51%) had more Dropouts than Graduates. Harrison (47%) and Kelvyn Park (44%) did slightly better. Among the six schools with sizable Hispanic minorities, two (Kelly - 53%, and Lakeview - 52%) had more Dropouts than Graduates. Richards Vocational, however, had a significantly lower Dropout Rate of 33%. Two of these schools were majority White (Schurz and Kelly), two majority Black (Orr and Bowen) and two mixed but with more Hispanics than others (Richards Vocational and Lakeview). Only two of the 17 schools between 5% and 24% Hispanic had Dropout Rates over 50% (Farragut - 55%, and Tilden - 52%). Lane (15%), Young (19%), and Prosser (23%) had low Dropout Rates. Six of these schools were majority Black, eight were majority White, and three were mixed.

Schools over 50% Hispanic had the highest proportion of overage entering students in the system, 35%. Schools with only 5-24% Hispanics had the lowest figure (20%), while schools with significant Hispanic minorities and schools without Hispanics were close to the systemwide average of 26%. Juarez led all Hispanic schools with 47% entering overage (second systemwide only to Robeson), and none of the majority Hispanic schools received less than 30% overage.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

STUDENT OUTCOMES
RANK ORDERED BY PERCENT HISPANIC

TABLE 16

RANK	UNIT #SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED w/ ORIG SCH	PERCENT w/ NORMAL SCORES	PERCENT w/o SCORES	PERCENT w/o BELOW NORM SCORES
1	1890 Juarez	8	Gen	508	50.9%	4.7%	1.8%	0.0%	92.1%	46.8%	93.3%	25.0%	35.0%	40.0%
2	1840 Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	56.1%	7.3%	10.8%	0.6%	81.1%	30.6%	88.9%	26.3%	14.6%	59.0%
3	1410 Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	387	44.4%	34.0%	1.2%	1.7%	62.8%	30.3%	88.2%	39.2%	17.6%	43.2%
4	1640 Wells	6	Gen	569	55.6%	12.1%	25.8%	0.0%	61.7%	34.9%	84.5%	30.8%	18.5%	50.8%
5	1370 Harrison +	8	Gen	322	47.3%	0.7%	37.3%	0.3%	57.1%	36.1%	87.1%	30.7%	16.5%	52.8%
6	1110 Richards Voc	11	Voc	182	33.3%	26.4%	23.6%	0.0%	46.2%	19.8%	74.2%	56.0%	8.2%	35.7%
7	1430 Lakeview	3	Gen	452	52.1%	40.3%	11.1%	6.0%	41.2%	26.4%	83.6%	43.6%	17.0%	39.4%
8	1240 Bowen	19	Gen	773	47.7%	1.7%	58.7%	0.1%	38.7%	32.5%	87.8%	30.9%	17.6%	51.5%
9	1530 Schurz	4	Gen	940	48.9%	61.3%	3.7%	2.7%	30.6%	23.8%	90.3%	51.6%	10.7%	37.7%
10	1400 Kelly	8	Gen	416	52.6%	73.1%	0.0%	1.0%	26.0%	22.4%	94.2%	49.8%	23.3%	26.9%
11	1830 Orr	5	Gen	589	48.0%	3.1%	69.1%	0.8%	25.5%	30.5%	74.9%	21.7%	11.4%	66.9%
12	1620 Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	49.4%	8.8%	65.7%	0.7%	23.0%	28.9%	73.0%	36.5%	10.9%	52.6%
13	1300 Farragut	10	Gen	569	55.3%	0.9%	76.4%	0.2%	22.5%	32.4%	79.2%	30.2%	9.5%	60.3%
14	1540 Senn	2	Gen	597	42.4%	36.0%	19.6%	21.7%	21.7%	32.7%	84.1%	29.8%	30.2%	40.0%
15	1070 Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	22.9%	54.7%	22.0%	1.3%	21.2%	8.3%	88.1%	72.8%	24.4%	2.8%
16	1610 Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	30.8%	46.5%	22.8%	12.7%	17.3%	22.3%	91.6%	52.6%	13.3%	34.1%
17	1520 Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	50.4%	67.8%	6.4%	9.2%	15.4%	20.9%	89.0%	52.2%	16.6%	31.3%
18	1820 Curie	12	Gen	735	29.0%	57.3%	25.7%	1.1%	15.4%	15.6%	91.0%	57.1%	18.2%	24.6%
19	1590 Tilden	13	Gen	563	51.8%	10.1%	75.7%	0.2%	13.9%	31.7%	86.0%	24.6%	8.5%	67.0%
20	1630 Washington	20	Gen	369	23.5%	83.5%	0.3%	0.8%	13.8%	19.8%	97.8%	71.0%	8.7%	20.3%
21	1570 Sullivan	2	Gen	325	34.9%	43.7%	32.0%	9.5%	12.6%	22.5%	84.0%	48.0%	17.5%	34.5%
22	1330 Foreman	4	Gen	311	37.6%	85.5%	1.0%	0.6%	12.2%	22.5%	92.3%	56.9%	13.8%	29.3%
23	1810 Young	9	Gen	559	19.0%	27.5%	52.2%	5.5%	12.2%	7.9%	83.4%	63.1%	31.1%	5.7%
24	1440 Lane	3	Tech	882	15.3%	64.9%	12.1%	11.9%	10.8%	2.7%	90.2%	96.6%	3.2%	0.2%
25	1210 Amundsen	2	Gen	398	45.7%	74.9%	4.0%	7.5%	10.6%	26.4%	89.7%	43.2%	21.4%	35.4%
26	1670 Hubbard	15	Gen	341	40.4%	86.3%	2.8%	1.2%	9.7%	22.6%	93.5%	68.0%	11.1%	20.8%
27	1800 Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	40.0%	25.0%	64.6%	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%	87.5%	91.7%	2.1%	6.3%
28	1340 Gage Park	12	Gen	503	48.9%	38.9%	52.3%	0.8%	8.0%	18.3%	86.3%	40.8%	5.8%	53.5%
29	1560 Steinmetz	4	Gen	524	35.0%	76.1%	15.1%	4.0%	4.0%	18.5%	94.1%	57.4%	13.7%	28.8%
30	1230 Bogan	15	Gen	300	10.8%	95.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	19.3%	96.7%	82.7%	9.7%	7.7%
31	1480 Mather	2	Gen	382	21.9%	74.3%	10.2%	11.5%	2.9%	14.9%	93.2%	71.2%	14.1%	14.7%
32	1420 Kennedy	12	Gen	370	29.5%	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	2.2%	16.8%	91.9%	69.5%	9.2%	21.4%
33	1580 Taft	1	Gen	509	18.2%	91.0%	6.7%	0.6%	1.8%	8.5%	95.9%	79.0%	10.0%	11.0%
34	1710 Kenwood	14	Gen	516	19.4%	17.8%	72.9%	2.7%	1.6%	9.5%	80.4%	70.3%	12.2%	17.4%
35	1310 Fergar	20	Gen	558	56.3%	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.7%	29.7%	86.2%	26.9%	10.8%	62.4%
36	1490 Morgan Park	18	Gen	469	27.1%	35.4%	63.1%	0.2%	0.6%	27.6%	92.5%	60.2%	4.7%	34.5%
37	1010 Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	27.1%	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.5%	9.5%	87.4%	86.3%	4.8%	9.9%
38	1510 Phillips	11	Gen	858	57.4%	0.1%	99.5%	0.0%	0.3%	38.2%	86.5%	23.5%	5.8%	70.5%
39	1450 Lindblom	15	Tech	616	22.0%	0.2%	95.8%	3.7%	0.3%	4.9%	82.1%	81.3%	17.0%	1.6%
40	1220 Austin	7	Gen	882	62.1%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	27.4%	69.5%	18.4%	9.9%	71.8%
41	1360 Harper	15	Gen	457	53.6%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	35.2%	74.8%	21.2%	7.0%	71.8%
42	1460 Manley	8	Gen	573	53.2%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	36.4%	80.3%	19.7%	7.0%	73.3%
43	1870 Julian	18	Gen	573	32.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	17.5%	89.2%	56.5%	5.9%	37.5%
44	1680 Englewood	16	Gen	594	53.5%	0.0%	99.0%	0.0%	0.2%	40.2%	83.0%	34.8%	10.3%	54.9%
45	1030 Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	28.0%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	11.3%	89.1%	82.9%	5.9%	11.2%
46	1350 Harlan	19	Gen	696	43.6%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	26.3%	85.2%	38.4%	8.5%	53.2%
47	1550 South Shore	17	Gen	723	53.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.1%	23.9%	83.8%	38.0%	10.7%	51.3%
48	1050 Near No. Career Mags	3	Voc	87	59.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.4%	78.2%	27.6%	13.8%	58.6%
49	1380 Hirsh.	17	Gen	359	45.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.4%	77.7%	37.3%	6.7%	56.0%
50	1850 Carver	20	Gen	616	48.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	83.6%	45.1%	8.4%	46.4%
51	1040 Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	42.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%	69.0%	38.0%	9.0%	53.0%
52	1150 Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	34.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	86.0%	75.8%	5.8%	18.4%
53	1760 King, M.L.	14	Gen	454	50.2%	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	34.0%	83.5%	28.0%	9.9%	62.1%
54	1250 Calumet	16	Gen	752	53.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	80.6%	36.3%	7.8%	55.9%
55	1280 DuSable	13	Gen	632	58.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	89.2%	27.7%	7.1%	65.2%
56	1160 Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	433	22.1%	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	82.7%	85.0%	2.1%	12.9%
57	1860 Corliss	20	Gen	621	33.6%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	86.6%	55.7%	3.9%	40.4%
58	1880 Collins	8	Gen	440	48.1%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	79.8%	26.1%	9.3%	64.5%
59	1470 Marshall	9	Gen	546	57.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.0%	36.6%	77.7%	22.2%	9.5%	68.3%
60	1270 Crane	9	Gen	628	62.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.6%	82.0%	40.3%	9.2%	50.5%
61	1320 Robeson	16	Gen	658	57.4%	0.3%	99.5%	0.0%	0.0%	50.2%	84.5%	44.1%	7.4%	48.5%
62	1390 Hyde Park	14	Gen	724	37.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	84.7%	57.7%	6.4%	35.9%
63	1020 Gregier Voc	9	Voc	217	54.8%	0.5%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	40.3%	63.6%	32.7%	7.4%	59.9%
	SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,142	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%	11.6%	41.3%
	SCHOOLS 50% HISPANIC			2,813	52.7%	10.8%	14.0%	0.5%	74.2%	35.0%	87.8%	29.1%	19.7%	51.3%
	SCHOOLS 25% - 49% HISPANIC			3,352	48.4%	34.0%	29.5%	1.3%	33.3%	26.3%	85.7%	40.5%	14.7%	44.8%
	SCHOOLS 5% - 24% HISPANIC			7,641	36.2%	47.5%	31.0%	5.7%	14.8%	19.8%	87.5%	54.3%	15.0%	30.7%
	SCHOOLS LESS THAN 5% HISPANIC			19,090	42.8%	10.3%	88.3%	0.6%	0.5%	25.7%	84.1%	48.4%	8.4%	43.2%
	SPECIAL SCHOOLS TOTALS			159	66.3%	6.9%	61.0%	0.0%	30.2%	71.2%	22.6%	3.8%	22.6%	73.6%
						50% Hispani	4.3%	1.9%	12.1%	2.1%				
						25% Hispani	16.0%	4.8%	12.1%	10.0%				
						5% Hispanic	51.1%	11.4%	63.6%	70.6%				
						Less	0.0%	81.3%	9.1%	17.3%				

Hispanic schools varied in their retention of their originally entering students. Juarez had a high transfer rate for students leaving the system (14%), but had only 7% transfer to another Chicago school. At the other extreme, Harrison had 15% transfer out of the system and 19% transfer to other Chicago schools. Richards Vocational had only 8% leave the system, but 26% transfer to other Chicago schools, which looks suspiciously like students are being pushed out of Richards into the general high schools. Orr also had about 25% transfer to other Chicago schools.

Majority Hispanic schools received 71% of their students with below normal reading scores or without scores. It must be remembered that students in level A of Bilingual education programs are not tested for English reading proficiency. 60% of students in heavily minority Hispanic schools are in the same category. Juarez received only 25% of its students with normal reading scores; 40% were below normal and 35% had no recorded scores. Clemente received only 26% with normal scores (59% were below normal, 15% without scores). By comparison, Kelvyn Park looked good at only 61% below or missing, but that figure was close to the proportion of entering students who were Hispanic (63%); 43% were reading below normal and 18% were without scores. Among the minority Hispanic schools, Richards Vocational had only 44% below normal or missing scores, but Orr had 78%, though only 26% of its entrants were Hispanic. Thus, heavily Hispanic high schools received high concentrations of students who were ill-equipped to do high school work in English, and were already overage. It is not surprising that their Dropout Rates exceed their Graduation Rates.

The Dropout Rate for Hispanics in majority and minority Hispanic schools closely followed the overall Dropout Rates for these schools in the aggregate. However, White students in majority Hispanic schools dropped out more frequently (63% vs. 52% for Hispanics), while Blacks did better than Hispanics (48%). Whites also did worse in heavily minority (25%-49%) Hispanic schools (53%), with Blacks still at 48%, but Hispanic Dropout Rates dipped to 44%. Hispanic Dropout Rates continue to decline with declining concentrations, to 40% (for 5%-24% Hispanic schools) and 34% in schools with less than 5% Hispanics enrolled. Among the majority Hispanic schools, Kelvyn Park Hispanics had the lowest Dropout Rate (42%) with Juarez next (49%). Clemente (56%), Wells (55%), and Harrison (51%) all had more Hispanics drop out than graduate. All of these schools also had high rates of transfers to other school systems. The outcomes of these transfers out of the system are unknown. At some heavily minority Hispanic schools, Hispanics did better: Richards Vocational (30%), Bowen (40%), and Kelly (41%). The lowest Hispanic Dropout Rates at schools with more than 5% Hispanic were at Prosser Vocational (19%), Metro (25%), and Lane Tech. (25%).

DROP OUT STUDY-CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — RANK ORDER BY PERCENT HISPANIC — TABLE 17

School Level Data - Class of 1982

SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

RANK	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	WHITE ENROLLED	BLACK ENROLLED	ASIAN ENROLLED	HISPANIC ENROLLED	WHITE DROPOUT RATE	BLACK DROPOUT RATE	ASIAN DROPOUT RATE	HISPANIC DROPOUT RATE	OVERALL DROPOUT RATE
1	Juarez	8	Gen	497	4.8%	1.6%	0.0%	93.6%	77.8%	28.6%	ERR	49.4%	50.2%
2	Clemente	6	Gen	1,056	7.4%	10.8%	0.6%	81.2%	66.2%	55.1%	16.7%	55.7%	56.1%
3	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	346	33.8%	1.2%	1.7%	63.0%	50.0%	66.7%	16.7%	41.7%	44.4%
4	Wells	6	Gen	568	12.1%	25.9%	0.0%	61.6%	78.9%	47.7%	ERR	54.8%	55.6%
5	Harrison *	8	Gen	319	4.7%	37.6%	0.3%	57.4%	54.5%	41.1%	ERR	51.0%	47.1%
6	Richards Voc	11	Voc	175	27.4%	24.6%	0.0%	48.0%	42.2%	26.8%	ERR	29.9%	32.5%
7	Lakeview	3	Gen	448	40.4%	11.2%	6.0%	41.5%	60.5%	59.0%	33.3%	44.4%	52.1%
8	Bowen	19	Gen	764	1.7%	59.3%	0.1%	38.0%	61.5%	52.4%	0.0%	39.8%	47.7%
9	Schurz	4	Gen	921	62.4%	3.8%	2.7%	31.1%	48.4%	58.1%	13.0%	50.2%	48.3%
10	Orr	5	Gen	577	3.1%	70.0%	0.9%	26.0%	78.6%	44.4%	33.3%	52.8%	47.3%
11	Kelly	8	Gen	412	73.3%	0.0%	1.0%	25.7%	56.6%	ERR	25.0%	40.7%	52.6%
12	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	270	8.9%	66.3%	0.7%	23.3%	89.5%	43.8%	0.0%	54.0%	49.2%
13	Farragut	10	Gen	564	0.9%	76.2%	0.2%	22.7%	50.0%	53.6%	0.0%	61.7%	55.3%
14	Senn	2	Gen	593	35.6%	19.4%	21.4%	21.4%	42.3%	50.5%	38.5%	37.2%	42.3%
15	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	54.7%	22.0%	1.3%	21.2%	27.5%	15.4%	0.0%	19.2%	22.8%
16	Jon Stauben	1	Gen	343	46.6%	23.0%	12.8%	17.5%	30.8%	34.7%	21.2%	31.0%	30.8%
17	Roosevelt	1	Gen	432	68.3%	6.5%	9.3%	15.5%	51.6%	57.1%	22.6%	54.5%	50.1%
18	Curie	12	Gen	728	57.6%	25.8%	1.1%	15.4%	22.9%	35.4%	14.3%	43.8%	29.1%
19	Washington	20	Gen	364	84.6%	0.3%	0.8%	14.0%	22.6%	0.0%	33.3%	28.0%	23.1%
20	Tilden	13	Gen	559	10.2%	73.7%	0.2%	14.0%	77.1%	48.0%	100.0%	54.7%	51.7%
21	Sullivan	2	Gen	319	44.5%	32.6%	9.7%	12.8%	35.1%	43.5%	12.5%	28.6%	34.3%
22	Young	9	Gen	543	28.4%	53.4%	5.7%	12.5%	27.0%	14.7%	3.4%	23.8%	18.6%
23	Foreman	4	Gen	310	85.8%	1.0%	0.6%	12.3%	37.4%	0.0%	0.0%	46.7%	37.8%
24	Amundsen	2	Gen	388	76.5%	4.1%	7.7%	10.8%	47.8%	61.5%	30.8%	29.4%	45.7%
25	Lane	3	Tech	881	64.9%	12.1%	11.9%	10.8%	15.6%	21.2%	3.3%	25.3%	15.8%
26	Hubbard	15	Gen	339	85.8%	2.9%	1.2%	9.7%	39.4%	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	40.3%
27	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	25.0%	64.6%	0.0%	8.3%	36.4%	41.4%	ERR	25.0%	40.0%
28	Gage Park	12	Gen	501	38.9%	52.3%	0.8%	8.0%	54.1%	47.0%	25.0%	37.8%	48.7%
29	Steinmetz	4	Gen	519	76.7%	15.2%	4.0%	4.0%	36.0%	34.2%	16.7%	33.3%	34.8%
30	Bogan	15	Gen	299	96.0%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	10.9%	ERR	0.0%	9.1%	10.3%
31	Mather	2	Gen	378	75.1%	10.3%	11.6%	2.9%	21.5%	38.9%	9.8%	22.2%	21.9%
32	Kennedy	12	Gen	370	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	2.2%	25.2%	41.7%	ERR	37.5%	29.5%
33	Taft	1	Gen	508	90.9%	6.7%	0.6%	1.8%	17.1%	31.3%	0.0%	33.3%	18.2%
34	Kenwood	14	Gen	489	18.6%	76.9%	2.9%	1.6%	6.7%	22.2%	16.7%	0.0%	18.9%
35	Fenger	20	Gen	558	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	56.2%	ERR	100.0%	56.3%
36	Morgan Park	18	Gen	464	35.8%	63.4%	0.2%	0.6%	23.5%	28.4%	0.0%	66.7%	26.9%
37	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,029	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.5%	ERR	27.1%	ERR	40.0%	27.1%
38	Lindblom	15	Tech	614	0.2%	95.8%	3.7%	0.3%	0.0%	22.0%	19.0%	100.0%	22.0%
39	Phillips	11	Gen	849	0.1%	99.6%	0.0%	0.2%	100.0%	57.4%	ERR	50.0%	57.4%
40	Austin	7	Gen	878	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	100.0%	62.0%	ERR	100.0%	62.1%
41	Harper	15	Gen	455	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	53.5%	ERR	100.0%	53.6%
42	Manley	8	Gen	568	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	53.2%	ERR	ERR	53.2%
43	Julian	18	Gen	572	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	32.5%	ERR	0.0%	32.5%
44	Englewood	16	Gen	580	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	53.0%	ERR	100.0%	53.1%
45	Carter Voc	11	Voc	607	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	ERR	28.0%	ERR	0.0%	27.9%
46	Harlan	19	Gen	692	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	43.5%	ERR	100.0%	43.6%
47	South Shore	17	Gen	719	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	ERR	53.2%	ERR	0.0%	53.2%
48	Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	86	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	59.7%	ERR	ERR	59.7%
49	Dunbar Voc	16	Voc	484	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	38.1%	ERR	ERR	38.1%
50	DuSable	13	Gen	627	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	58.4%	ERR	ERR	58.4%
51	Calumet	16	Gen	749	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	53.4%	ERR	ERR	53.4%
52	Flower Voc	7	Voc	199	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	42.6%	ERR	ERR	42.6%
53	Crane	9	Gen	587	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	62.6%	ERR	ERR	62.6%
54	Collins	8	Gen	439	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	48.1%	ERR	ERR	48.1%
55	Carver	20	Gen	613	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	48.4%	ERR	ERR	48.4%
56	Hyde Park	14	Gen	722	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	37.6%	ERR	ERR	37.6%
57	Hirsh	17	Gen	359	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	45.7%	ERR	ERR	45.7%
58	Curtiss	20	Gen	613	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	33.5%	ERR	ERR	33.5%
59	Marshall	9	Gen	542	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	57.2%	ERR	ERR	57.3%
60	Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	831	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	ERR	ERR	22.1%
61	Robeson	16	Gen	653	0.3%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	57.3%	ERR	ERR	57.3%
62	King, M.L.	14	Gen	453	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.6%	ERR	ERR	50.2%
63	Ziegler Voc	9	Voc	216	0.9%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	55.3%	ERR	ERR	54.8%
	DISTRICTWIDE TOTALS			32,810	21.6%	52.8%	1.9%	13.6%	34.6%	45.1%	19.4%	46.9%	42.7%
AVE CLASS													
557	SCHOOLS MORE THAN 50% HISPANIC			2,786	10.3%	14.1%	0.5%	74.4%	63.2%	47.6%	16.7%	52.2%	52.5%
549	SCHOOLS 25% - 49% HISPANIC			3,297	34.5%	29.3%	1.9%	33.6%	52.8%	48.4%	23.6%	44.2%	48.1%
445	SCHOOLS 5% - 24% HISPANIC			7,568	47.8%	31.1%	5.8%	14.3%	33.7%	40.6%	20.4%	39.7%	36.1%
540	SCHOOLS LESS THAN 5% HISPANIC			18,921	10.4%	88.5%	0.6%	0.5%	21.8%	45.4%	13.4%	33.7%	42.8%
	PERCENT OF RACE IN EACH GROUPING	50+% Hispanic			4.3%	1.3%	2.1%	46.5%					
		25%-49% Hispanic			16.1%	4.2%	10.0%	24.9%					
		5%-24% Hispanic			51.1%	11.4%	70.6%	25.3%					
		Under 5% Hispanic			27.9%	81.2%	17.3%	2.1%					

H. DISTRICT ANALYSIS

Districts with the best Graduation Rates received the best students. A district's Graduation Rate correlates highly with its percent of entering students reading at or above normal rangs. Four of the six districts graduating less than half of their students (Districts 16, 8, 17, 13, 10, and 6) had more than 70% of their entering students with reading scores more than two years behind grade level or missing. Similarly, in these six districts over a quarter of the entering students (over a third in 5 of the 6) were overage. Thus, the high schools in these districts were receiving students who were already in trouble academically.

The districts with the best Graduation Rates are located on the outer fringe of the city or along the lakefront. Only District 11, among Inner City districts, ranked higher than a Fringe district (# 4), and special conditions make these distinctions fuzzy. District 11 has a number of non-geographic high schools, while District 4 is a mixture of inner city and fringe areas. All of these inner city districts are overwhelmingly minority in their student enrollments. The Dropout Rates in these inner city districts range from 38% to 57%.

The Dropout Rates between Fringe and Lakefront districts and those in the Inner City are markedly different. The combined rate for Fringe and for Lakefront districts is 34.4% and 35.2% respectively, but is 47.9% for Inner City districts. Inner City district schools were overwhelmingly minority in their entering class, together enrolling only 6% Whites. 83% of all Whites attended schools in Fringe or Lakefront districts, and most of the remaining Whites attended Kelly or Washington High Schools, majority White schools in otherwise Inner City districts. The high schools in Fringe and Lakefront Districts received better prepared students than did schools in Inner City districts. Fringe and Lakefront district schools, in the aggregate, received 59% and 54% of their students reading at or above normal ranges. Only 40% of Inner City district students had reading scores at or above normal. Similarly, less than 20% of Fringe and Lakefront students were overage, while 30% of Inner City students were, and, as we have already mentioned, in five of these districts, more than a third were overage.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

SCHOOLS ORGANIZED BY DISTRICT

TABLE 18

SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	TRANSFER RATE	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED ORIG SCH	PERCENT w/ NORMAL SCORES	PERCENT w/o SCORES	PERCENT BELOW NORM SCORES
Roosevelt	1	Gen	435	-3.8%	50.4%	67.8%	6.4%	9.2%	15.4%	20.9%	89.0%	52.2%	16.6%	31.3%
Von Steuben	1	Gen	346	17.1%	30.2%	46.5%	22.8%	12.7%	17.3%	22.3%	91.6%	52.6%	13.3%	34.1%
Taft	1	Gen	509	6.1%	18.2%	91.0%	6.7%	0.6%	1.8%	8.5%	95.9%	79.0%	10.0%	11.0%
Amundsen	2	Gen	398	14.6%	45.7%	74.9%	4.0%	7.5%	10.6%	26.4%	89.7%	43.2%	21.4%	35.4%
Senn	2	Gen	597	13.7%	42.4%	36.0%	19.6%	21.7%	21.7%	32.7%	84.1%	29.8%	30.2%	40.0%
Sullivan	2	Gen	325	21.5%	34.9%	43.7%	32.0%	9.5%	12.6%	22.5%	84.0%	48.0%	17.5%	34.5%
Mather	2	Gen	382	10.2%	21.9%	74.3%	10.2%	11.5%	2.9%	14.9%	93.2%	71.2%	14.1%	14.7%
Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	87	10.3%	59.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.4%	78.2%	27.6%	13.8%	58.6%
Lakeview	3	Gen	452	15.7%	52.1%	40.3%	11.1%	6.0%	41.2%	26.4%	83.6%	43.6%	17.0%	39.4%
Lincoln Park	3	Gen	274	11.7%	49.4%	8.8%	65.7%	0.7%	23.0%	28.9%	73.0%	36.5%	10.9%	52.6%
Lane	3	Tech	882	9.4%	15.9%	64.9%	12.1%	11.9%	10.8%	2.7%	90.2%	96.6%	3.2%	0.2%
Wilson Occ. (Prosser	4	Spec	2	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Schurz	4	Gen	940	12.7%	48.9%	61.3%	3.7%	2.7%	30.6%	23.8%	90.3%	51.6%	10.7%	37.7%
Foreman	4	Gen	311	19.6%	37.6%	85.5%	1.0%	0.6%	12.2%	22.5%	92.3%	56.9%	13.8%	29.3%
Steinmetz	4	Gen	528	10.3%	35.0%	76.1%	15.1%	4.0%	4.0%	18.5%	94.1%	57.4%	13.7%	28.8%
Prosser Voc	4	Voc	386	9.6%	22.9%	54.7%	22.0%	1.3%	21.2%	8.3%	88.1%	72.8%	24.4%	2.8%
Orr	5	Gen	589	11.0%	48.0%	3.1%	69.1%	0.8%	25.5%	30.5%	74.9%	21.7%	11.4%	66.9%
Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	347	15.3%	44.4%	34.0%	1.2%	1.7%	62.8%	30.3%	88.2%	39.2%	17.6%	43.2%
Wm Cir Andersen	6	EVOC	60	10.0%	72.2%	8.3%	16.7%	0.0%	73.3%	76.7%	21.7%	6.7%	35.0%	58.3%
Clemente	6	Gen	1,067	11.5%	56.1%	7.3%	10.8%	0.6%	81.1%	30.6%	88.9%	26.3%	14.6%	59.0%
Wells	6	Gen	569	15.1%	55.6%	12.1%	25.8%	0.0%	61.7%	34.9%	84.5%	30.8%	18.5%	50.8%
Mclaren Occupational	7	Spec	1	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Austin	7	Gen	882	5.6%	62.1%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	27.4%	69.5%	18.4%	9.9%	71.8%
Flower Voc	7	Voc	200	5.5%	42.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.1%	69.0%	38.0%	9.0%	53.0%
Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	433	3.5%	22.1%	0.2%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	82.7%	85.0%	2.1%	12.9%
Manley	8	Gen	573	4.7%	53.2%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	36.4%	80.3%	19.7%	7.0%	73.3%
Kelly	8	Gen	416	10.3%	52.6%	73.1%	0.0%	1.0%	26.0%	22.4%	94.2%	49.8%	23.3%	26.9%
Juarez	8	Gen	508	13.8%	50.9%	4.7%	1.8%	0.0%	92.1%	46.8%	93.3%	25.0%	35.0%	40.0%
Collins	8	Gen	440	4.5%	48.1%	0.3%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	33.4%	79.8%	26.1%	9.3%	64.5%
Harrison *	8	Gen	322	14.3%	47.3%	4.7%	37.3%	0.3%	57.1%	36.1%	81.1%	30.7%	16.5%	52.8%
Crane	9	Gen	628	5.8%	62.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.6%	82.0%	40.3%	9.2%	50.5%
Marshall	9	Gen	546	4.6%	57.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.0%	36.6%	77.7%	22.2%	9.5%	68.3%
Crespler Voc	9	Voc	277	3.7%	54.8%	0.3%	99.1%	0.0%	0.0%	40.3%	63.6%	32.7%	7.4%	59.9%
Spaulding	9	Spec	87	29.9%	27.6%	46.5%	47.7%	0.0%	5.8%	36.0%	67.8%	26.4%	36.8%	36.8%
Young	9	Gen	559	10.2%	19.0%	27.5%	52.2%	5.5%	12.2%	7.9%	83.4%	63.1%	31.1%	5.7%
Industrial Skills	10	Voc	10	10.0%	100.0%	0.0%	70.0%	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
Farragut	10	Gen	569	6.3%	55.3%	0.3%	76.4%	0.2%	22.5%	32.4%	79.3%	30.2%	9.5%	60.3%
Phillips	11	Gen	858	5.0%	57.4%	0.1%	99.5%	0.0%	0.3%	38.2%	85.5%	23.5%	5.8%	70.5%
Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	48	6.3%	40.0%	25.0%	64.6%	0.0%	8.3%	4.2%	87.5%	91.7%	2.1%	6.3%
Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	608	6.7%	28.0%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.2%	11.3%	89.1%	82.9%	5.9%	11.2%
Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	1,031	6.5%	27.1%	0.0%	99.5%	0.0%	0.5%	9.5%	87.4%	85.3%	4.8%	9.9%
Roy Graham Trng Sch.	11	Spec	6	0.0%	25.0%	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Doyle Park	12	Gen	503	7.4%	48.9%	38.9%	52.3%	0.8%	8.0%	18.3%	86.3%	40.8%	5.8%	53.5%
Richards Voc *	12	Voc	182	7.7%	33.3%	26.4%	23.6%	0.0%	46.2%	19.8%	74.2%	56.0%	8.2%	35.7%
Kennedy	12	Gen	370	6.5%	29.5%	73.2%	24.6%	0.0%	2.2%	16.8%	91.9%	69.5%	9.2%	21.4%
Carle	12	Gen	735	9.0%	29.0%	57.3%	25.7%	1.1%	15.4%	15.6%	91.0%	57.1%	18.2%	24.6%
DuSable	13	Gen.	632	4.1%	58.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	89.2%	27.7%	7.1%	65.2%
Tilden	13	Gen	563	8.9%	51.8%	10.1%	75.7%	0.2%	13.9%	31.7%	86.0%	24.6%	8.5%	67.0%
King, M.L.	14	Gen	454	5.5%	50.2%	0.7%	99.3%	0.0%	0.0%	34.0%	83.5%	28.0%	9.9%	62.1%
Hyde Park	14	Gen	724	5.8%	37.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.5%	84.7%	57.7%	6.4%	35.9%
Kenwood	14	Gen	516	14.9%	19.4%	17.8%	72.9%	2.7%	1.6%	9.5%	80.4%	70.3%	12.2%	17.4%
Harper	15	Gen	457	8.1%	53.6%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	35.2%	74.3%	21.2%	7.0%	71.8%
Hubbard	15	Gen	341	11.4%	40.4%	85.3%	2.9%	1.2%	9.7%	22.6%	93.5%	68.0%	11.1%	20.8%
Lindblom	15	Tech	616	10.4%	22.0%	0.2%	95.8%	3.7%	0.3%	4.9%	82.1%	81.3%	17.0%	1.6%
Logan	15	Gen	300	7.7%	10.8%	95.7%	0.0%	0.3%	3.7%	19.3%	96.7%	82.7%	9.7%	7.7%
Roberson	16	Gen	658	15.7%	57.4%	0.3%	99.5%	0.0%	0.0%	50.2%	84.5%	44.1%	7.4%	48.5%
Englewood	16	Gen	594	6.2%	53.5%	0.0%	99.0%	0.0%	0.2%	40.2%	83.0%	34.8%	10.3%	54.9%
Calumet	16	Gen	752	10.2%	53.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	37.2%	80.6%	36.3%	7.8%	55.9%
Simeon Voc	16	Voc	484	6.6%	34.1%	0.0%	100.7%	0.0%	0.0%	20.2%	86.0%	75.8%	5.8%	18.4%
South Shore	17	Gen	723	7.5%	53.3%	0.0%	99.6%	0.0%	0.1%	23.8%	83.8%	38.0%	10.7%	51.3%
Hirsh	17	Gen	359	8.6%	45.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	35.4%	77.7%	37.3%	6.7%	56.0%
Julian	18	Gen	573	6.8%	32.5%	0.0%	99.8%	0.0%	0.2%	17.5%	89.2%	56.5%	5.9%	37.5%
Morgan Park	19	Gen	469	6.6%	27.1%	35.4%	63.1%	0.2%	0.6%	27.6%	92.5%	60.8%	4.7%	34.5%
Mary M. Thorp	19	EVOC	79	5.1%	58.1%	0.0%	97.5%	0.0%	2.5%	61.5%	3.8%	2.5%	2.5%	94.9%
Brown	19	Gen	773	7.8%	47.7%	1.7%	58.7%	0.1%	38.7%	32.5%	97.8%	30.9%	17.6%	51.5%
Harlan	19	Gen	696	6.8%	43.6%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	26.3%	85.2%	38.4%	8.5%	53.2%
Las Casas (Brown)	19	Spec	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Penger	20	Gen	553	11.5%	56.3%	0.2%	99.1%	0.0%	0.7%	29.7%	86.2%	26.9%	10.8%	62.4%
Carver	20	Gen	616	5.2%	48.4%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.0%	83.6%	45.1%	8.4%	46.4%
Curtiss	20	Gen	621	11.1%	33.6%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	86.6%	55.7%	3.9%	40.4%
Washington	20	Gen	397	7.3%	23.5%	83.5%	0.3%	0.8%	13.8%	19.8%	97.8%	71.0%	8.7%	20.3%
DISTRICTWIDE TOTALS			33,142	9.2%	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%	11.6%	41.3%

* Richards Vocational is located in District 12, where it is located, not in District 11 from which it is administered.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

DISTRICTS RANKED BY DROPOUT RATE

TABLE 19

RANK	DISTRICT	TYPE	GEOG	ENTERING FRESHMEN	TRANSFER RATE	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED GRAD SCH	PERCENT AT NORMAL SCORES	PERCENT W/O SCORES	PERCENT BELOW NORM SCORES
1	6	Innsty	NW	1,696	12.7%	56.6%	9.0%	16.0%	0.4%	74.3%	33.7%	85.1%	27.1%	16.6%	56.3%
2	10	Innsty	W	579	6.4%	56.1%	0.3%	76.3%	0.2%	22.5%	33.6%	79.6%	29.7%	10.4%	59.9%
3	13	Innsty	S	1,195	6.4%	55.4%	4.8%	88.5%	0.1%	6.5%	34.4%	87.7%	26.2%	7.2%	66.0%
4	17	Innsty	S	1,082	7.3%	50.8%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	27.7%	81.8%	37.8%	9.3%	52.9%
5	8	Innsty	W	2,259	9.2%	50.8%	15.1%	50.6%	0.2%	33.7%	35.5%	85.8%	29.3%	18.1%	52.6%
6	16	Innsty	S	2,488	10.0%	50.5%	0.1%	99.6%	0.0%	.0%	38.0%	83.2%	45.7%	7.0%	46.4%
7	7	Innsty	W	1,516	4.3%	48.0%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	22.3%	73.2%	40.0%	7.6%	52.4%
8	9	Innsty	W	2,037	7.5%	47.5%	9.6%	84.5%	1.5%	3.6%	29.4%	78.6%	40.3%	16.3%	43.4%
9	5	Innsty	NW	936	12.6%	46.7%	14.5%	43.3%	1.2%	39.3%	30.5%	79.8%	28.2%	13.7%	58.1%
10	19	Innsty	S	1,549	7.2%	46.3%	0.3%	79.1%	0.1%	19.5%	31.2%	82.4%	32.8%	12.7%	54.5%
11	20	Innsty	S	2,164	9.0%	41.9%	14.3%	82.7%	0.1%	2.5%	24.3%	87.6%	47.9%	7.8%	44.4%
12	4	Pringe	NW	2,163	12.6%	39.2%	67.2%	9.3%	2.5%	19.8%	19.6%	91.1%	57.5%	14.3%	28.2%
13	11	Innsty	S	2,551	6.0%	37.8%	0.7%	98.7%	0.0%	0.5%	19.6%	87.2%	63.3%	5.6%	30.5%
14	2	Lakfnt	N	1,702	14.6%	37.0%	55.3%	16.2%	13.7%	13.1%	25.3%	87.4%	45.7%	22.1%	32.2%
15	14	Lakfnt	S	1,694	8.5%	36.0%	5.6%	91.6%	0.8%	0.5%	18.6%	83.1%	53.6%	9.1%	37.3%
16	12	Pringe	SW	1,790	7.3%	35.2%	52.3%	32.7%	0.7%	13.7%	17.0%	88.2%	55.0%	11.8%	33.2%
17	3	Lakfnt	N	1,695	11.5%	32.7%	45.9%	25.0%	7.9%	20.3%	15.1%	85.1%	69.2%	8.7%	22.1%
18	15	Pringe	SW	1,714	9.5%	32.1%	33.8%	61.6%	1.6%	2.7%	19.0%	85.0%	62.9%	11.9%	25.2%
19	1	Pringe	N	1,290	11.6%	32.0%	71.2%	10.9%	6.7%	10.5%	16.4%	92.4%	62.9%	13.1%	24.0%
20	18	Pringe	SW	1,042	6.7%	30.0%	15.9%	83.3%	0.1%	0.4%	22.0%	90.7%	58.4%	5.4%	36.2%
				33,142	9.2%	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%	11.6%	41.3%

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

DISTRICTS ORGANIZED BY AREA OF CITY AND RANKED BY DROPOUT RATE

TABLE 20

RANK	DISTRICT	TYPE	GEOG	ENTERING FRESHMEN	TRANSFER RATE	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED GRAD SCH	PERCENT AT NORMAL SCORES	PERCENT W/O SCORES	PERCENT BELOW NORM SCORES
1	18	Pringe	SW	1,042	6.7%	30.0%	15.9%	83.3%	0.1%	0.4%	22.0%	90.7%	58.4%	5.4%	36.2%
2	1	Pringe	N	1,290	11.6%	32.0%	71.2%	10.9%	6.7%	10.5%	16.4%	92.4%	62.9%	13.1%	24.0%
3	15	Pringe	SW	1,714	9.5%	32.1%	33.8%	61.6%	1.6%	2.7%	19.0%	85.0%	62.9%	11.9%	25.2%
4	12	Pringe	SW	1,790	7.3%	35.2%	52.3%	32.7%	0.7%	13.7%	17.0%	88.2%	55.0%	11.8%	33.2%
5	4	Pringe	NW	2,163	12.6%	39.2%	67.2%	9.3%	2.5%	19.8%	19.6%	91.1%	57.5%	14.3%	28.2%
1	3	Lakfnt	N	1,695	11.5%	32.7%	45.9%	25.0%	7.9%	20.3%	15.1%	85.1%	69.2%	8.7%	22.1%
2	14	Lakfnt	S	1,694	8.5%	36.0%	5.6%	91.6%	0.8%	0.5%	18.6%	83.1%	53.6%	9.1%	37.3%
3	2	Lakfnt	N	1,702	14.6%	37.0%	55.3%	16.2%	13.7%	13.1%	25.3%	87.4%	45.7%	22.1%	32.2%
1	11	Innsty	S	2,551	6.0%	37.8%	0.7%	98.7%	0.0%	0.5%	19.6%	87.2%	63.3%	5.6%	30.5%
2	20	Innsty	S	2,164	9.0%	41.9%	14.3%	82.7%	0.1%	2.5%	24.3%	87.6%	47.9%	7.8%	44.4%
3	19	Innsty	S	1,549	7.2%	46.3%	0.3%	79.1%	0.1%	19.5%	31.2%	82.4%	32.8%	12.7%	54.5%
4	5	Innsty	NW	936	12.6%	46.7%	14.5%	43.3%	1.2%	39.3%	30.5%	79.8%	28.2%	13.7%	58.1%
5	9	Innsty	W	2,037	7.5%	47.5%	9.6%	84.5%	1.5%	3.6%	29.4%	78.6%	40.3%	16.3%	43.4%
6	7	Innsty	W	1,516	4.3%	48.0%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	22.3%	73.2%	40.0%	7.6%	52.4%
7	16	Innsty	S	2,488	10.0%	50.5%	0.1%	99.6%	0.0%	.0%	38.0%	83.2%	45.7%	7.0%	46.4%
8	8	Innsty	W	2,259	9.2%	50.8%	15.1%	50.6%	0.2%	33.7%	35.5%	85.8%	29.3%	18.1%	52.6%
9	17	Innsty	S	1,082	7.3%	50.8%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	27.7%	81.8%	37.8%	9.3%	52.9%
10	13	Innsty	S	1,195	6.4%	55.4%	4.8%	88.5%	0.1%	6.5%	34.4%	87.7%	26.2%	7.2%	66.0%
11	10	Innsty	W	579	6.4%	56.1%	0.3%	76.3%	0.2%	22.5%	33.6%	79.6%	29.7%	10.4%	59.9%
12	6	Innsty	NW	1,696	12.7%	56.6%	9.0%	16.0%	0.4%	74.3%	33.7%	85.1%	27.1%	16.6%	56.3%
				33,142	9.2%	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%	11.6%	41.3%

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS
School Level Data - Class of 1982
SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

DISTRICTS ORGANIZED GEOGRAPHICALLY AND RANKED BY DROPOUT RATE

TABLE 21

RANK	DISTRICT	TYPE	GEOG	ENTERING FRESHMEN	TRANSFER RATE	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED GRAD SCH	PERCENT AT NORMAL SCORES	PERCENT W/O SCORES	PERCENT BELOW NORM SCORES
1	1	Pringe	N	1,290	11.6%	32.0%	71.2%	10.9%	6.7%	10.5%	16.4%	92.4%	62.9%	13.1%	24.0%
2	3	Lakfnt	N	1,695	11.5%	32.7%	45.9%	25.0%	7.9%	20.3%	15.1%	85.1%	69.2%	8.7%	22.1%
3	2	Lakfnt	N	1,702	14.6%	37.0%	55.3%	16.2%	13.7%	13.1%	25.3%	87.4%	45.7%	22.1%	32.2%
4	4	Pringe	NW	2,163	12.6%	39.2%	67.2%	9.3%	2.5%	19.8%	19.6%	91.1%	57.5%	14.3%	28.2%
5	5	Innsty	NW	936	12.6%	46.7%	14.5%	43.3%	1.2%	39.3%	30.5%	79.8%	28.2%	13.7%	58.1%
6	6	Innsty	NW	1,696	12.7%	56.6%	9.0%	16.0%	0.4%	74.3%	33.7%	85.1%	27.1%	16.6%	56.3%
7	14	Lakfnt	S	1,694	8.5%	36.0%	5.6%	91.6%	0.8%	0.5%	18.6%	83.1%	53.6%	9.1%	37.3%
8	11	Innsty	S	2,551	6.0%	37.8%	0.7%	98.7%	0.0%	0.5%	19.6%	87.2%	63.3%	5.6%	30.5%
9	20	Innsty	S	2,164	9.0%	41.9%	14.3%	82.7%	0.1%	2.5%	24.3%	87.6%	47.9%	7.8%	44.4%
10	19	Innsty	S	1,549	7.2%	46.3%	0.3%	79.1%	0.1%	19.5%	31.2%	82.4%	32.8%	12.7%	54.5%
11	16	Innsty	S	2,488	10.0%	50.5%	0.1%	99.6%	0.0%	.0%	38.0%	83.2%	45.7%	7.0%	46.4%
12	17	Innsty	S	1,082	7.3%	50.8%	0.0%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	27.7%	81.8%	37.8%	9.3%	52.9%
13	13	Innsty	S	1,195	6.4%	55.4%	4.8%	88.5%	0.1%	6.5%	34.4%	87.7%	26.2%	7.2%	66.0%
14	18	Pringe	SW	1,042	6.7%	30.0%	15.9%	83.3%	0.1%	0.4%	22.0%	90.7%	58.4%	5.4%	36.2%
15	15	Pringe	SW	1,714	9.5%	32.1%	33.8%	61.6%	1.6%	2.7%	19.0%	85.0%	62.9%	11.9%	25.2%
16	12	Pringe	SW	1,790	7.3%	35.2%	52.3%	32.7%	0.7%	13.7%	17.0%	88.2%	55.0%	11.8%	33.2%
17	9	Innsty	W	2,037	7.5%	47.5%	9.6%	84.5%	1.5%	3.6%	29.4%	78.6%	40.3%	16.3%	43.4%
18	7	Innsty	W	1,516	4.3%	48.0%	0.1%	99.7%	0.0%	0.1%	22.3%	73.2%	40.0%	7.6%	52.4%
19	8	Innsty	W	2,259	9.2%	50.8%	15.1%	50.6%	0.2%	33.7%	35.5%	85.8%	29.3%	18.1%	52.6%
20	10	Innsty	W	579	6.4%	56.1%	0.3%	76.3%	0.2%	22.5%	33.6%	79.6%	29.7%	10.4%	59.9%
				33,142	9.2%	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	25.5%	85.0%	47.1%	11.6%	41.3%

When the districts are grouped geographically, some other facts appear. Districts on the northside and the southwest side had the highest Graduation Rates (66% and 67%). Westside districts had the highest Dropout Rates (50%). Students from the North and Northwest districts transferred out of the Chicago Public Schools at half again the rate of other sections of the city (13% vs. about 8%). 61% of all Whites went to school in the North and Southwest side districts; another 25% attended in Northwest districts. More than half (56%) of Blacks attended Southside schools and 23% on the Westside. The remaining 20% were spread among North, Northwest and Southwest district schools. As might be expected, North and Southwest district schools received fewer overage students (under 20%) and more students reading at or above normal levels (59%). West (65%) and Northwest (59%) districts received the most poorly prepared students (those reading below normal or without reading scores). Five districts had fewer than 30% of their entering students with normal or above test scores; the worst was on the Southside (District 13 in the Englewood area, 26%), two were on the Westside (Districts 8 - 29%, and 10 - 30%), and two were on the Northwest side with heavy concentrations of Hispanics (Districts 6 - 27%, and 5 - 28%).

H. SPECIAL SCHOOLS

There were 256 freshmen who entered high school in specialized schools. Half of these were in ninth grade in two Educational and Vocational Guidance Centers (Thorp and Andersen) before entering full high schools after ninth grade. These schools are for students who need special help. Their students were predominantly overage (62% and 77%) and below normal or missing reading scores (98% and 93%). Thorp was 98% Black; Andersen was 73% Hispanic and 17% Black. However, 42% of Thorp's students eventually graduated, while only 28% of Andersen's did.

Spaulding is a school for multiply handicapped students or students who are hospitalized or homebound and taught by tutors. 32% of Spaulding's original freshmen transferred into regular high schools before completing their high school career. Spaulding graduated 72% of its students.

Five other special schools had a few entering students: Industrial Skills Center, Ray Graham Training School, Wilson Occupational (a branch of Prosser), Las Casas (a branch of Bowen), and McLaren Occupational. These schools primarily handle special education students and receive most of their students as transfers from regular high schools.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — OUTCOMES FOR ENTERING STUDENTS - SPECIAL SCHOOLS — TABLE 22

School Level Data - Class of 1982

SIX YEAR TIME FRAME

SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	TRANSFER RATE	DROPOUT RATE	WHITE	BLACK	ASIAN	HISPANIC	OVER AGE	COMPLETED ORIG SCH	PERCENT w/ NORMAL SCORES	PERCENT w/o SCORES	PERCENT BELOW NORM SCORES
Spaulding	9	Spec	87	29.9%	27.6%	46.5%	47.7%	0.0%	5.8%	36.0%	67.8%	26.4%	36.8%	36.8%
James M. Thorp	19	EVOC	79	5.1%	58.1%	0.0%	97.5%	0.0%	2.5%	61.5%	3.8%	2.5%	2.5%	94.9%
Jane Chn Andersen	6	EVOC	60	10.0%	72.2%	8.3%	16.7%	0.0%	73.3%	76.7%	21.7%	6.7%	35.0%	58.3%
Industrial Skills	10	Voc	10	10.0%	100.0%	0.0%	70.0%	0.0%	20.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
Ray Graham Trng Sch.	11	Spec	6	0.0%	25.0%	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Wilson Occ. (Prosser	4	Spec	2	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Las Casas (Bowen)	19	Spec	1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
McLaren Occupational	7	Spec	1	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
SPECIAL SCHOOLS TOTALS			159	7.5%	65.3%	6.9%	61.0%	0.0%	30.2%	71.8%	22.6%	3.8%	22.6%	73.6%
SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			33,142	9.2%	42.8%	21.4%	62.6%	1.9%	13.5%	2[illegible].5%	85.0%	47.1%	11.6%	41.3%

IV. THREE YEAR COMPARISONS
The Classes of 1982, 1983, and 1984

In order to analyze three consecutive years of student outcomes, it is necessary to find ways to compare similar data. At the end of the year in which a student's class graduates, about 10% of the class is still enrolled in a Chicago Public School. During the next two years, all but about one half of one percent complete their high school career, by transferring, graduating, or dropping out. Thus, for accurate results, the best point from which to analyze the outcomes of an entering freshman class is in the fall, two years after the normal graduation date (six years after entry). September 30th was chosen as the best cut-off date, from the data available for this study.

However, in order to compare the three most recent years, it is impossible to employ this method; a six-year analytic time frame for the Class of 1984 will not be possible until September 30, 1986. Therefore, it was necessary to find some approximation which will accurately predict the final data. After careful examination of alternatives, it was determined that by using the September 30th following a class's normal graduation as a cut-off date, and excluding from consideration those students who were still active, Graduation and Dropout Rates citywide were very close to the final rates after six years. The Dropout Rate for the Class of 1982 varied by only one-half of one percent, between the approximate data (which will be henceforth referred to as "trend data") and the results determined after six years. Therefore, systemwide trend data, while not final, can be expected to be quite accurate.

However, when trends are examined at the local school level, the same degree of precision cannot be assumed. At schools with high Graduation Rates, the number of remaining actively enrolled students is likely to be significantly lower than at schools with much lower Graduation Rates. Thus, it is to be expected that the number of still active students will not be distributed evenly among all schools. This phenomenon introduces a degree of uncertainty in doing trend analysis for the most recent years. Additionally, school-level delays in reporting data may slightly increase the margin of error for the most recent year. Of course, long term trend analysis, using a six year time frame, would not suffer from these complications. However, the trend analysis included in this section is for the three most recent years, and should, therefore, be treated cautiously.

A. THREE YEAR COMPARISONS - SYSTEMWIDE

Comparisons of the Classes of 1982, 1983, and 1984 reveal that the number of students who entered high school declined significantly between 1983 and 1984. Since enrollment has been declining for the system as a whole for more than 15 years, this decline, at first, does not appear unusual. However, closer scrutiny disclosed that the enrollment decline was not spread generally across all groups. In fact, the decline is almost entirely restricted to entering 14 year olds:

	ENTERING STUDENTS		
AGE	1982	1983	1984
13-	928	907	938
14	21,056	20,638	17,899
15	6,759	6,772	6,541
16+	925	1,000	1,024

It appears this change in the enrollment pattern reflects the implementation of a newly enforced promotion policy which first affected students entering high school in the Fall of 1980, those who would become the Class of 1984. This policy was designed to retain in elementary schools those students whose reading scores were the furtherest below grade level. When reading scores were examined, the enrollment decline was again disproportionately linked to decreases in entrants reading below normal reading levels:

READING	1982	1984	CHANGE	PERCENT
Normal +	14,499	13,358	-1,141	- 7.9%
Below Norm	11,998	8,359	-3,639	-30.3%
w/o scores	3,828	3,489	- 399	- 8.9%

This policy seems to have reduced the number of normal aged entrants and worked to raise the percentage of students reading at or above normal levels for the Class of 1984. However, it must be anticipated that this policy would raise the number of overage students entering the Class of 1985. This policy appears to have had greater effect on males than on females, though significantly affecting both sexes:

GENDER	1982	1983	1984
Males(14)	9,767	9,620	8,035
Females(14)	11,289	11,018	9,864

The number of entering males dropped by 1,585 (down 16%) between 1983 and 1984, while the number of females dropped by

only 1,154 (down 10%). The effect of this policy was to increase the percentage of overage students, both male and female, but not the actual numbers, in the Class of 1984.

PERCENT OVERAGE

GENDER	1982	1983	1984
Male	4,572 (31%)	4,562 (31%)	4,359 (34%)
Female	3,112 (21%)	3,210 (22%)	3,211 (24%)
Total	7,684 (26%)	7,782 (27%)	7,570 (29%)

As the students retained in 1980 moved on into high school in 1981, as part of the Class of 1985, that class would experience an increase in overage students, both percentagewise and in actual numbers. A corresponding increase in the Dropout Rate can be expected for the Class of 1985!

There were few changes in the racial composition of the Class of 1984 when compared with the Class of 1982. Blacks declined slightly and Hispanics increased slightly:

RACE	1982	1983	1984
Black	62%	60%	60%
White	22%	23%	22%
Hispanic	13%	15%	15%
Asian	2%	3%	3%
Amer. Indian	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%

However, the decrease in 14 year old entrants did not affect the races in the same way. White 14 year olds entering school in September 1980 were 17% less than in the preceeding year; Blacks were 11% less; and Hispanics were 10% less. These figures probably reflect the effect of the promotion policy, at least in part. The higher decrease for White youth, however, may also reflect White flight from the threat of desegregation. In September 1980 the Chicago Board of Education entered into a well publicized, court approved, Consent Decree in which it agreed to end the existence of predominantly White schools. Because the Board would not make available data on reading scores by race, it is impossible to distinguish between the effects of the promotion policy and of threatened desegregation for these White students.

RACE	1982	1983	1984	CHANGE
Black	12,783	12,228	10,834	-11%
White	5,384	5,300	4,384	-17%
Hispanic	2,410	2,502	2,260	-10%

CHANGES IN THE DROPOUT RATE

The Dropout Rate for the Class of 1984 showed a drop of 3% from that of 1982, primarily as a result of these changes in enrollment occasioned by the implementation of the promotion policy. However, it should be expected that the Dropout Rate for the Class of 1985 would be even higher than that for 1982 with increased numbers of overage students.

	1982	1983	1984
Dropout Rate	42.4%*	41.6%	39.5%

The Dropout Rate decreased more for males that it did for females, reflecting the higher retention of males as a result of the promotion policy:

GENDER	1982	1983	1984
Males	49.5%	47.9%	45.7%
Females	35.6%	35.5%	33.8%

The Dropout Rate declined more for Blacks and Hispanics than for Whites, a fact which seems to indicate that the promotion policy had greater impact on those races than on Whites. This fact also gives support to the potential impact of the desegregation consent decree on the White entrants of the Class of 1984. sIf more leaving White 14 year olds were reading at or above normal levels, a smaller reduction in the Dropout Rate would be expected.

RACE	1982	1983	1984
Black	45%	44%	42%
White	33%	34%	33%
Hispanic	47%	46%	43%

The decrease in the Dropout Rate between 1982 and 1984 was greater for Black and Hispanic males than for White males or females of any of these racial/ethnic groups, except Hispanic females whose rate was erratic.

Black	Male	54%	52%	50%
	Female	38%	37%	36%
White	Male	37%	38%	36%
	Female	29%	29%	29%
Hispanic	Male	54%	50%	48%
	Female	39%	42%	37%

The Dropout Rate for 14 year olds dropped 2% between 1983 and 1984 (from 34% to 32%), but had already dropped 3% in 1983, though the decrease in that year had been offset by increases in the other age groups. The departure of White 14 year olds reading at normal levels may have minimized the decrease in the Dropout Rate for this age group systemwide.

*This "trend" number varies by 0.4% from the six year rate (42.8%).

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — ENROLLMENT CHANGES — TABLE 23
School Level Data
THREE YEAR COMPARISONS

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	1982 TOTAL ENROLL	1983 TOTAL ENROLL	1984 TOTAL ENROLL	1984vs82 CHANGE ENROLL	PERCENT CHANGE ENROLL
1	1050	Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	73	249	3	(70)	-95.9%
2	1220	Austin	7	Gen	776	40	139	(637)	-82.1%
3	1250	Calumet	16	Gen	667	529	338	(329)	-49.3%
4	1340	Gage Park	12	Gen	440	66	240	(200)	-45.5%
5	1350	Harlan	19	Gen	645	429	405	(240)	-37.2%
6	1610	Von Steuben	1	Gen	319	217	205	(114)	-35.7%
7	1510	Phillips	11	Gen	710	560	470	(240)	-33.8%
8	1550	South Shore	17	Gen	664	562	442	(222)	-33.4%
9	1300	Farragut	10	Gen	487	439	327	(160)	-32.9%
10	1640	Wells	6	Gen	511	367	344	(167)	-32.7%
11	1320	Robeson	16	Gen	585	568	402	(183)	-31.3%
12	1590	Tilden	13	Gen	465	447	327	(138)	-29.7%
13	1680	Englewood	16	Gen	476	365	337	(139)	-29.2%
14	1460	Manley	8	Gen	481	311	341	(140)	-29.1%
15	1240	Bowen	19	Gen	680	584	501	(179)	-26.3%
16	1160	Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	412	386	309	(103)	-25.0%
17	1430	Lakeview	3	Gen	409	399	308	(101)	-24.7%
18	1270	Crane	9	Gen	494	474	376	(118)	-23.9%
19	1890	Juarez	8	Gen	434	403	336	(98)	-22.6%
20	1360	Harper	15	Gen	399	393	310	(89)	-22.3%
21	1850	Carver	20	Gen	552	427	438	(114)	-20.7%
22	1480	Mather	2	Gen	364	361	290	(74)	-20.3%
23	1830	Orr	5	Gen	501	451	420	(81)	-16.2%
24	1760	King,M.L.	14	Gen	411	494	351	(60)	-14.6%
25	1020	Crespier Voc	9	Voc	174	136	150	(24)	-13.8%
26	1390	Hyde Park	14	Gen	653	554	563	(90)	-13.8%
27	1070	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	373	358	323	(50)	-13.4%
28	1530	Schurz	4	Gen	845	795	736	(109)	-12.9%
29	1580	Taft	1	Gen	489	515	429	(60)	-12.3%
30	1810	Young	9	Gen	533	504	471	(62)	-11.6%
31	1860	Corliss	20	Gen	547	642	486	(61)	-11.2%
32	1840	Clemente	6	Gen	925	1,026	830	(95)	-10.3%
33	1400	Kelly	8	Gen	359	25	325	(34)	-9.5%
34	1570	Sullivan	2	Gen	297	237	270	(27)	-9.1%
35	1310	Penger	20	Gen	504	519	463	(41)	-8.1%
36	1030	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	548	568	523	(25)	-4.6%
37	1210	Amundsen	2	Gen	365	376	349	(16)	-4.4%
38	1330	Foreman	4	Gen	289	306	280	(9)	-3.1%
39	1670	Hubbard	15	Gen	321	373	312	(9)	-2.8%
40	1450	Lindblom	15	Tech	578	735	568	(10)	-1.7%
41	1490	Morgan Park	18	Gen	429	410	422	(7)	-1.6%
42	1630	Washington	20	Gen	343	444	341	(2)	-0.6%
43	1280	DuSable	13	Gen	559	552	564	5	0.9%
44	1470	Marshall	9	Gen	457	424	462	5	1.1%
45	1380	Hirsh	17	Gen	318	260	323	5	1.6%
46	1520	Roosevelt	1	Gen	395	378	407	12	3.0%
47	1010	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	936	926	977	41	4.4%
48	1710	Kenwood	14	Gen	497	577	525	28	5.6%
49	1560	Steinmetz	4	Gen	489	516	520	31	6.3%
50	1820	Curie	12	Gen	664	722	719	55	8.3%
51	1370	Harrison +	8	Gen	285	323	309	24	8.4%
52	1540	Senn	2	Gen	551	637	620	69	12.5%
53	1870	Julian	18	Gen	627	689	698	71	13.5%
54	1420	Kennedy	12	Gen	329	382	374	45	13.7%
55	1230	Bogan	15	Gen	292	341	335	43	14.7%
56	1880	Collins	8	Gen	393	374	461	68	17.3%
57	1150	Gleason Voc	16	Voc	462	525	552	90	19.5%
58	1110	Richards Voc	11	Voc	166	199	205	39	23.5%
59	1040	Flower Voc	7	Voc	166	185	207	41	24.7%
60	1440	Lane	3	Tech	826	1,162	1,065	239	28.9%
61	1410	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	312	326	410	98	31.4%
62	1800	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	40	45	56	16	40.0%
63	1620	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	260	261	415	155	59.6%
		SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS			29,668	28,031	26,492	(3,176)	-10.7%
		TOP THIRD TOTALS			10,679	8,215	6,898	(3,781)	-35.4%
		MID THIRD TOTALS			9,848	9,859	8,902	(946)	-9.6%
		LOW THIRD TOTALS			8,924	9,804	10,104	1,180	13.2%

B. SCHOOL LEVEL COMPARISONS

Changes in Enrollment

Systemwide, enrollment in the entering freshman class declined by 3,176 students between the Classes of 1982 and 1984. While two-thirds of all schools experienced decreases in their entering classes, a third experienced increases. Apparently missing data distorts the picture for three schools, Near North Career Magnet, Gage Park, and Austin. Five other schools lost more than a third, when compared with their 1982 class: Calumet (49%), Harlan (37%), Von Steuben (36%), Phillips (34%), and South Shore (34%). The size of the entering class at 22 schools declined by more than 20%, and another ten lost more than 10%. But 12 schools gained more than 10%, led by Lincoln Park (60%, with the addition of a new Baccalaureate program designed to appeal to Near North White students), Metro (40%), Kelvyn Park (31%, following an influx of Hispanics in that part of the city), and Lane (29%). Except for Lane, the ten schools with the largest percent enrollment increases all had smaller than average class size.

Changes in the Dropout Rate

Systemwide, the Dropout Rate declined by almost three percentage points between 1982 and 1984, using these early measures, with comparable data. However, this change did not occur uniformly across all schools. Thirty-four schools reduced their Dropout Rates, but at 29 schools, the rate went up. Three schools reduced their Dropout Rate by more than ten percentage points (Fenger, down 16.3%; Englewood, 11.7%; Harlan, 10.4%). 11 other schools reduced the Dropout Rate by at least 5%. Of these 14 schools, all but Roosevelt, Metro, and Lincoln Park (which by 1984 had added a specialized program attractive to White students) were virtually all-minority schools. Among these all-minority schools, only Lindbloom and Julian had received high proportions of well-prepared students in 1982. Nine of these 14 schools had 1982 Dropout Rates above 50%. Fenger, Englewood, and Marshall all moved down on the ranking of schools with the worst Dropout Rates, with Fenger improving its ranking by 26 places. Fenger and Englewood each moved into the mid-range of schools in 1984. Thus, the largest school-level reductions in the Dropout Rate happened, for the most part, at schools which had the most severe problems.

But at a number of schools, the Dropout Rate rose. The Dropout Rate at ten schools rose by more than 5%, with Cregier Vocational experiencing the largest increase (12%). Among these ten schools, Bogan (89%) and Sullivan (44%) had had significant concentrations of Whites in the 1982 entering class. Only three of these schools, Cregier Vocational, Manley, and Farragut, had been in the worst third of schools in 1982. Hirsh and Orr dropped into the third of all schools with the worst Dropout Rates, losing 20 and 11 places,

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — CHANGES IN THE DROPOUT RATE - Rank Order: Change 1982 to 1984 — TABLE 24

School Level Data

THREE YEAR COMPARISONS

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	1982 DROP RATE	1982 DROP RANK	1983 DROP RATE	1983 DROP RANK	1984 DROP RATE	1984 DROP RANK	1984vs82 CHANGE DROPOUTS	1984vs83 CHANGE DROPOUTS	1984vs82 RANK CHANGE
1	1310	Fenger	20	Gen	58.5%	8	49.8%	26	42.1%	34	-16.3%	-7.6%	(26)
2	1680	Englewood	16	Gen	57.8%	10	53.7%	19	46.1%	28	-11.7%	-7.6%	(18)
3	1350	Harlan	19	Gen	45.0%	34	40.1%	38	34.6%	42	-10.4%	-5.5%	(8)
4	1270	Crane	9	Gen	67.0%	1	65.6%	3	58.3%	8	-8.7%	-7.3%	(7)
5	1450	Lindblom	15	Tech	21.8%	55	18.3%	60	14.0%	62	-7.8%	-4.3%	(7)
6	1520	Roosevelt	1	Gen	50.9%	22	46.7%	29	43.1%	31	-7.7%	-3.5%	(9)
7	1220	Austin	7	Gen	62.6%	2	54.5%	18	55.5%	11	-7.1%	0.9%	(9)
8	1620	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	49.6%	26	44.9%	32	42.7%	32	-6.8%	-2.2%	(6)
9	1470	Marshall	9	Gen	60.3%	4	51.2%	24	53.5%	15	-6.7%	2.4%	(11)
10	1760	King, M.L.	14	Gen	52.1%	21	55.2%	17	45.7%	29	-6.3%	-9.5%	(8)
11	1870	Julian	18	Gen	30.7%	47	34.1%	43	25.2%	53	-5.5%	-8.9%	(6)
12	1890	Juarez	8	Gen	53.0%	19	41.3%	36	47.5%	25	-5.5%	6.2%	(6)
13	1800	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	35.1%	40	34.1%	42	29.8%	46	-5.3%	-4.4%	(6)
14	1590	Tilden	13	Gen	54.3%	16	55.6%	16	49.0%	24	-5.3%	-6.5%	(8)
15	1360	Harper	15	Gen	54.7%	14	59.2%	9	49.8%	21	-4.9%	-9.4%	(7)
16	1560	Steinmetz	4	Gen	34.2%	42	33.4%	46	29.4%	47	-4.8%	-4.0%	(5)
17	1840	Clemente	6	Gen	55.8%	12	60.0%	6	51.2%	20	-4.6%	-8.8%	(8)
18	1240	Bowen	19	Gen	48.4%	30	41.3%	37	44.3%	30	-4.1%	3.0%	0
19	1810	Young	9	Gen	17.8%	60	18.5%	59	13.8%	63	-4.0%	-4.7%	(3)
20	1030	Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	27.0%	50	26.9%	51	23.1%	54	-3.9%	-3.7%	(4)
21	1210	Aoundsen	2	Gen	45.5%	32	50.6%	25	42.2%	33	-3.2%	-8.4%	(1)
22	1540	Senn	2	Gen	43.6%	37	88.9%	1	40.5%	38	-3.2%	-48.4%	(1)
23	1040	Flower Voc	7	Voc	43.9%	36	44.0%	33	40.8%	37	-3.1%	-3.2%	(1)
24	1530	Schurz	4	Gen	49.7%	25	45.2%	31	46.6%	26	-3.1%	1.4%	(1)
25	1860	Corliss	20	Gen	31.5%	46	32.0%	48	28.4%	50	-3.1%	-3.6%	(4)
26	1320	Robeson	16	Gen	59.4%	6	60.1%	4	56.7%	9	-2.7%	-3.4%	(3)
27	1580	Taft	1	Gen	17.2%	61	17.9%	61	14.7%	60	-2.5%	-3.2%	1
28	1150	Simeon Voc	16	Voc	33.3%	44	32.3%	47	31.0%	45	-2.2%	-1.3%	(1)
29	1340	Gage Park	12	Gen	48.6%	27	43.3%	34	46.5%	27	-2.2%	3.2%	0
30	1250	Calumet	16	Gen	54.2%	17	55.6%	14	52.6%	17	-1.6%	-3.1%	0
31	1390	Hyde Park	14	Gen	36.9%	39	35.4%	41	36.0%	41	-0.9%	0.6%	(2)
32	1850	Carver	20	Gen	50.0%	24	55.6%	15	49.2%	23	-0.8%	-6.3%	1
33	1480	Mather	2	Gen	20.0%	58	22.2%	56	19.2%	58	-0.8%	-2.9%	0
34	1010	Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	26.8%	51	23.6%	54	26.1%	51	-0.7%	2.5%	0
35	1630	Washington	20	Gen	22.6%	54	21.0%	58	22.8%	55	0.2%	1.9%	(1)
36	1440	Lane	2	Tech	13.5%	62	16.9%	62	14.3%	61	0.8%	-2.6%	1
37	1070	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	21.4%	56	25.6%	52	22.4%	56	0.9%	-3.2%	0
38	1530	Foreman	4	Gen	35.1%	41	39.4%	39	36.3%	40	1.2%	-3.1%	1
39	1420	Kennedy	12	Gen	29.7%	48	23.6%	55	31.2%	44	1.4%	7.6%	4
40	1670	Hubbard	15	Gen	40.4%	38	32.8%	46	42.1%	36	1.7%	9.3%	2
41	1710	Kenwood	14	Gen	19.3%	59	24.0%	53	21.3%	57	2.0%	-2.7%	2
42	1430	Lakeview	3	Gen	52.2%	20	59.4%	7	54.6%	14	2.4%	-4.8%	6
43	1950	South Shore	17	Gen	54.0%	18	49.7%	27	56.5%	10	2.5%	6.8%	8
44	1220	Carie	12	Gen	26.5%	52	27.3%	50	29.2%	48	2.7%	1.9%	4
45	1280	DuSable	13	Gen	59.7%	5	67.6%	2	62.5%	3	2.9%	-5.0%	2
46	1610	Von Steuben	1	Gen	29.1%	49	33.7%	44	32.1%	43	3.0%	-1.6%	6
47	1490	Morgan Park	18	Gen	25.1%	53	28.3%	49	28.5%	49	3.4%	0.3%	4
48	1510	Phillips	11	Gen	58.1%	9	60.1%	5	61.6%	5	3.5%	1.5%	4
49	1400	Kelly	8	Gen	48.6%	28	45.8%	30	52.2%	18	3.6%	6.4%	10
50	1050	Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	62.5%	3	59.4%	8	66.7%	2	4.2%	7.3%	1
51	1880	Collins	8	Gen	48.5%	29	52.4%	22	53.1%	16	4.5%	0.6%	13
52	1370	Harrison +	8	Gen	46.3%	31	53.4%	20	51.5%	19	4.7%	-1.9%	12
53	1640	Wells	6	Gen	55.5%	13	56.7%	12	60.3%	6	4.7%	3.6%	7
54	1830	Orr	5	Gen	50.2%	23	56.4%	13	55.4%	12	5.2%	-0.9%	11
55	1410	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	44.0%	35	53.3%	21	49.3%	22	5.2%	-4.1%	13
56	1160	Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	20.4%	57	21.4%	57	25.7%	52	5.3%	4.2%	5
57	1110	Richards Voc	11	Voc	32.9%	45	42.4%	35	38.5%	39	5.6%	-3.9%	6
58	1300	Farragut	10	Gen	54.6%	15	58.8%	10	60.3%	7	5.6%	1.5%	8
59	1460	Manley	8	Gen	56.6%	11	51.9%	23	62.3%	4	5.7%	10.4%	7
60	1570	Sullivan	2	Gen	34.2%	43	38.2%	40	42.1%	35	7.9%	3.9%	8
61	1200	Bogan	15	Gen	10.0%	63	10.6%	63	18.3%	59	8.3%	7.7%	4
62	1380	Hirsh	17	Gen	45.3%	33	47.3%	28	55.1%	13	9.8%	7.8%	20
63	1020	Crosier Voc	9	Voc	59.3%	7	57.5%	11	71.4%	1	12.1%	13.9%	6

DISTRICTWIDE TOTALS	42.4%	41.1%	39.2%	-3.2%	-2.0%
TOP THIRD TOTALS	47.4%	44.5%	38.8%	-8.5%	-5.6%
MID THIRD TOTALS	35.6%	34.0%	32.8%	-2.8%	-1.2%
LOW THIRD TOTALS	44.7%	46.3%	48.0%	3.3%	1.8%

DROPOUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — TABLE 25
School Level Data — CLASS OF 1984 DROPOUT RATE

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	ENTER TOTAL 1984	CLASS OF 1984 DROPOUT	DROP RATE 1984
1	1020	Crespier Voc	150	95	71.4%
2	1050	Near No. Career Magn	3	2	66.7%
3	1280	DuSable	564	338	62.5%
4	1460	Manley	341	200	62.3%
5	1510	Phillips	470	279	61.6%
6	1640	Wells	344	173	60.3%
7	1300	Farragut	327	182	60.3%
8	1270	Crane	376	193	58.3%
9	1320	Robeson	402	199	56.7%
10	1550	South Shore	442	230	56.5%
11	1220	Austin #	139	71	55.5%
12	1830	Orr	420	204	55.4%
13	1380	Hirsh	323	161	55.1%
14	1430	Lakeview	308	147	54.6%
15	1470	Marshall	462	219	53.5%
16	1880	Collins	461	226	53.1%
17	1250	Calumet	338	162	52.6%
18	1400	Kelly	325	157	52.2%
19	1370	Harrison +	309	134	51.5%
20	1840	Clemente	830	356	51.2%
21	1360	Harper	310	140	49.8%
22	1410	Kelvyn Park	410	167	49.3%
23	1850	Carver	438	193	49.2%
24	1590	Tilden	327	129	49.0%
25	1890	Juarez	336	143	47.5%
26	1530	Schurz	736	298	46.6%
27	1340	Gage Park	240	105	46.5%
28	1680	Englewood	337	147	46.1%
29	1760	King,M.L.	351	150	45.7%
30	1240	Bowen	501	193	44.3%
31	1520	Roosevelt	407	151	43.1%
32	1620	Lincoln Park	415	156	42.7%
33	1210	Amundsen	349	125	42.2%
34	1310	Penger	463	166	42.1%
35	1570	Sullivan	270	96	42.1%
36	1670	Hubbard	312	117	42.1%
37	1040	Flower Voc	207	80	40.8%
38	1540	Senn	620	212	40.5%
39	1110	Richards Voc	205	72	38.5%
40	1330	Foreman	280	85	36.3%
41	1390	Hyde Park	563	186	36.0%
42	1350	Harlan	405	127	34.6%
43	1610	Von Steuben	205	60	32.1%
44	1420	Kennedy	374	111	31.2%
45	1150	Simeon Voc	552	163	31.0%
46	1800	Metro, Chicago	56	14	29.8%
47	1560	Steinmetz	520	137	29.4%
48	1820	Curie	719	193	29.2%
49	1490	Morgan Park	422	107	28.5%
50	1860	Corliss	486	123	28.4%
51	1010	Chicago Voc.	977	234	26.1%
52	1160	Westinghouse Voc	309	74	25.7%
53	1870	Julian	598	138	25.2%
54	1030	Dunbar Voc	523	108	23.1%
55	1630	Washington	341	69	22.8%
56	1070	Prosser Voc	323	66	22.4%
57	1710	Kenwood	525	99	21.3%
58	1480	Mather	290	51	19.2%
59	1230	Bogan	335	59	18.3%
60	1580	Taft	429	59	14.7%
61	1440	Lane	1,066	137	14.3%
62	1450	Lindblom	568	68	14.0%
63	1810	Young	471	59	13.8%
		SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS	26,492	9,399	39.6%

respectively, on the ranking of all schools. Bogan (up 8%) and Westinghouse (up 5%), had the largest increases in their Dropout Rates among the schools with the lowest rates. These changes left Young, Lindbloom, and Lane as the three schools with the lowest Dropout Rates--the system's most elite magnet school, and its two elite technical schools.

Changes in the Transfer Rate

Systemwide, there was virtually no change in the Transfer Rate. Only seven schools experienced a significant change in the number of students transfering out of the Chicago Public Schools. At five schools, the Transfer Rate went up by more than 5%: Tilden (9%), Metro (9%), Cregier Voc (7%), Marshall (6%), and Crane (5%). This made the rate at all these schools above 11%, With Tilden at 20% and Metro at 16%. With changes at other schools, that gave Tilden the highest rate in the city and Metro in sixth position. The Transfer Rate declined more than 5% at two schools: Von Steuben (9%) and Sullivan (8%), but this still left Sullivan eighth highest on the list.

Changes in Entering Reading Scores

The percentage of continuing students who entered high school reading at or above normal rates increased between 1982 and 1984 by 5% systemwide. Correspondingly, the Dropout Rate decreased by 3%. When the Dropout Rate for each Stanine (reporting category of reading scores) was compared, there were only minimal, and mostly offsetting, changes between 1982 and 1984. When the high schools were ranked by change in the Dropout Rate, the third of all schools with the largest reductions showed, in the aggregate, the largest increases in the percentage of entering students with normal or above reading scores (up 8%). This is primarily a one-time result of the implementation of the new promotion policy which <u>decreased</u> the number of Below Normal readers, <u>not</u> as a result of <u>increases</u> in the numbers of normal or above readers. The next third had a 6% increase in the proportion of students with normal rates. The third of all schools which showed increases in their Dropout Rates showed a miniscule increase in the proportion reading at normal rates (up 1%), but ten of these 21 schools showed decreases in the percent reading at normal or higher rates. It may be that the promotion policy was not implemented fully at the elementary feeders for these schools. Thus, in the aggregate, it appears that when entering reading scores rise, high school Dropout Rates fall.

However, when the individual schools are examined, the record is not quite so straightforward. Among the schools with the largest decreases in their Dropout Rates, three had gains of more than 10% in the proportion reading at normal levels: Lincoln Park (26%, largely as a result of the initiation of a new program attracting middle-class White students), Englewood (19%), and Fenger (12%). Three schools received a lower proportion reading normally: Metro (down 15%, but still at 78% in 1984), Flower Vocational (-4%), and Roosevelt (-3%). The entering class at Metro is so small,

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS CHANGES IN DROPOUT RATE FOR READING CATEGORIES - Ranked by Changes in Dropout Rate TABLE 26

School Level Data

TRENDS - COMPARING 1982 and 1

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	CHANGE OVERALL D/O RATE	1982 NORMAL D/O RATE	1984 NORMAL D/O RATE	CHANGE NORMAL D/O RATE	1982 BELOW NORM D/O RATE	1984 BELOW NORM D/O RATE	CHANGE BELOW NORM D/O RATE	1982 w/o score D/O RATE	1984 w/o score D/O RATE	CHANGE w/o score D/O RATE
1	1310	Fenger	-17.0%	39.5%	30.1%	-9.5%	64.9%	48.8%	-16.0%	72.5%	72.5%	0.2%
2	1890	Juarez	-12.0%	39.1%	33.7%	-5.4%	61.7%	50.0%	-11.7%	50.3%	52.3%	1.9%
3	1350	Harlan	-10.6%	32.6%	20.2%	-12.4%	53.9%	51.0%	-2.9%	50.9%	49.0%	-1.9%
4	1270	Crane	-9.6%	54.9%	48.3%	-6.6%	76.7%	65.4%	-11.3%	61.5%	70.7%	9.2%
5	1220	Austin *	-9.0%	48.4%	50.0%	1.6%	63.5%	52.0%	-11.5%	78.6%	82.2%	3.4%
6	1680	Englewood	-7.8%	43.8%	36.2%	-7.5%	57.4%	58.5%	1.1%	66.0%	73.8%	7.8%
7	1800	Metro, Chicago	-7.5%	35.3%	30.3%	-5.0%	50.0%	22.2%	-27.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	1470	Marshall	-7.2%	41.4%	33.3%	-8.1%	66.4%	58.8%	-6.5%	70.8%	69.0%	-1.8%
9	1520	Roosevelt	-7.1%	47.8%	44.4%	-3.4%	57.4%	43.8%	-13.6%	50.0%	49.1%	-0.9%
10	1620	Lincoln Park	-6.4%	46.5%	32.9%	-13.6%	52.6%	65.1%	12.5%	46.2%	46.2%	0.0%
11	1760	King,M.L.	-6.3%	43.4%	35.1%	-8.3%	56.0%	50.7%	-5.3%	51.2%	52.9%	1.7%
12	1450	Lindblom	-5.6%	19.8%	14.3%	-5.5%	44.4%	33.3%	-11.1%	28.3%	28.9%	0.6%
13	1240	Bowen	-5.2%	36.5%	26.7%	-9.8%	54.5%	58.8%	4.2%	49.2%	53.3%	4.1%
14	1840	Clemente	-5.2%	47.5%	38.6%	-8.9%	57.9%	56.5%	-1.4%	62.0%	64.6%	2.6%
15	1040	Flower Voc	-5.1%	36.7%	31.7%	-4.9%	48.8%	42.5%	-6.3%	47.1%	46.2%	-0.9%
16	1030	Dunbar Voc	-5.0%	27.6%	19.9%	-7.7%	17.3%	50.0%	32.7%	32.3%	37.0%	4.8%
17	1210	Amundsen	-4.9%	31.9%	33.8%	2.0%	56.2%	43.4%	-12.8%	54.9%	56.9%	2.0%
18	1530	Schurz	-4.6%	41.0%	37.0%	-4.0%	63.2%	60.2%	-3.0%	46.9%	47.1%	0.2%
19	1870	Julian	-4.5%	21.4%	20.7%	-0.7%	45.7%	36.4%	-9.4%	34.5%	37.5%	3.0%
20	1590	Tilden	-4.5%	47.7%	46.6%	-1.1%	56.2%	51.1%	-5.1%	57.9%	60.6%	2.7%
21	1560	Steinmetz	-4.1%	25.1%	23.9%	-1.2%	46.7%	39.8%	-6.9%	51.6%	50.9%	-0.7%
22	1390	Hyde Park	-3.3%	24.1%	26.7%	2.7%	62.6%	54.5%	-8.0%	27.9%	25.0%	-2.9%
23	1860	Cortina	-3.0%	19.7%	20.7%	1.0%	49.7%	39.2%	-10.5%	52.2%	45.0%	-7.2%
24	1360	Harper	-2.8%	40.0%	44.9%	4.9%	57.4%	52.8%	-4.6%	73.1%	78.9%	5.9%
25	1850	Carver	-2.4%	34.7%	35.2%	0.5%	63.3%	59.9%	-3.4%	61.4%	63.4%	2.1%
26	1340	Gage Park *	-2.3%	42.6%	37.7%	-4.8%	52.5%	57.0%	4.4%	60.9%	60.0%	-0.9%
27	1150	Simeon Voc	-2.1%	33.0%	28.8%	-4.2%	31.1%	43.3%	12.3%	40.7%	42.3%	1.6%
28	1580	Taft	-2.1%	13.7%	10.9%	-2.8%	33.3%	28.6%	-4.8%	34.1%	31.0%	-3.1%
29	1810	Young	-1.9%	14.3%	13.7%	-1.2%	28.6%	40.0%	11.4%	24.0%	22.1%	-1.8%
30	1070	Prosser Voc	-1.5%	21.1%	20.1%	-1.1%	50.0%	42.9%	-7.1%	22.1%	18.8%	-3.3%
31	1480	Mather	-1.4%	16.0%	15.2%	-0.9%	26.5%	21.4%	-5.1%	39.0%	35.9%	-3.1%
32	1540	Senn *	-1.0%	27.6%	28.0%	0.5%	46.8%	48.2%	1.4%	51.6%	54.3%	2.7%
33	1320	Robeson	-0.8%	46.7%	47.6%	0.9%	67.4%	73.9%	6.5%	82.1%	82.9%	0.8%
34	1250	Calumet	-0.5%	42.1%	35.7%	-6.1%	59.5%	62.7%	3.2%	72.7%	73.2%	0.4%
35	1010	Chicago Voc.	-0.3%	28.9%	28.5%	-0.4%	39.1%	48.2%	9.1%	38.1%	37.1%	-1.0%
36	1400	Kelly *	-0.1%	48.1%	44.6%	-3.5%	58.8%	67.2%	8.4%	55.3%	52.1%	-3.2%
37	1440	Lane	0.4%	13.2%	13.5%	0.3%	ERR	100.0%	ERR	21.1%	22.2%	1.2%
38	1610	Von Steuben	0.8%	22.4%	20.4%	-2.0%	39.3%	47.1%	7.8%	34.5%	36.0%	1.5%
39	1950	South Shore	1.6%	43.7%	43.6%	-0.1%	60.0%	64.6%	4.6%	63.2%	63.5%	0.3%
40	1510	Phillips	1.6%	42.4%	43.6%	1.2%	61.8%	64.1%	2.3%	71.1%	75.6%	4.5%
41	1820	Curtis	1.8%	20.6%	26.3%	5.8%	45.1%	38.5%	-6.6%	29.0%	23.4%	-5.6%
42	1300	Farragut	2.3%	39.7%	45.9%	6.2%	60.8%	60.7%	-0.1%	62.0%	65.1%	3.1%
43	1430	Lakeview	2.3%	48.4%	49.2%	0.8%	52.3%	56.7%	4.4%	60.7%	63.5%	2.7%
44	1280	DuSable	2.6%	44.5%	49.0%	4.4%	64.1%	69.0%	4.9%	80.0%	77.8%	-2.2%
45	1880	Collins	2.7%	30.8%	34.4%	3.6%	56.5%	62.8%	6.3%	48.6%	46.9%	-1.8%
46	1330	Foreman	3.4%	25.0%	31.1%	6.1%	46.2%	43.3%	-2.8%	54.8%	59.3%	4.4%
47	1710	Kenwood	3.5%	15.2%	17.4%	2.2%	25.5%	59.5%	34.0%	19.6%	19.0%	-0.5%
48	1420	Kennedy	3.7%	20.8%	21.4%	0.5%	55.4%	54.8%	-0.5%	45.2%	46.7%	1.5%
49	1670	Hubbard	3.8%	33.7%	33.8%	0.1%	53.4%	60.9%	7.5%	60.0%	64.0%	4.0%
50	1490	Morgan Park	4.0%	18.1%	19.2%	1.0%	38.1%	49.5%	11.5%	27.8%	25.0%	-2.8%
51	1640	Wells	4.5%	48.5%	42.1%	-6.4%	54.0%	66.7%	12.7%	72.6%	72.4%	-0.3%
52	1110	Richards Voc	4.8%	28.6%	27.6%	-0.9%	43.6%	48.5%	4.8%	14.3%	15.4%	1.1%
53	1160	Westinghouse Vo	4.8%	21.2%	24.7%	3.5%	16.3%	32.1%	15.8%	16.7%	0.0%	-16.7%
54	1410	Kelvyn Park	4.9%	36.5%	39.6%	3.0%	48.2%	55.2%	6.9%	51.1%	51.2%	0.1%
55	1830	Orr	5.1%	31.1%	48.6%	17.5%	55.3%	56.8%	1.5%	59.6%	61.4%	1.7%
56	1460	Manley	5.8%	41.1%	43.4%	2.4%	58.3%	66.3%	8.1%	80.0%	81.6%	1.6%
57	1370	Harrison *	6.3%	37.7%	48.1%	10.5%	48.0%	52.9%	4.9%	60.5%	62.2%	1.6%
58	1230	Bogan	7.7%	9.4%	14.7%	5.3%	15.0%	80.7%	65.7%	12.0%	12.0%	0.0%
59	1630	Washington	7.8%	16.2%	25.3%	9.1%	36.1%	35.9%	-0.1%	44.4%	50.0%	5.6%
60	1380	Hirsh	8.5%	32.4%	38.2%	5.9%	52.8%	64.1%	11.3%	47.8%	52.4%	4.6%
61	1570	Sullivan	10.1%	24.0%	33.7%	9.7%	42.3%	50.6%	8.3%	52.9%	55.2%	2.2%
62	1020	Crispler Voc	12.8%	46.6%	52.5%	5.9%	63.5%	79.5%	15.9%	34.6%	34.6%	0.0%
63	1050	Near No. Career	39.3%	29.4%	100.0%	70.6%	74.4%	ERR	ERR	75.0%	75.0%	0.0%
		CITYWIDE TOTAL	-2.7%	29.5%	28.3%	-1.2%	56.2%	56.0%	-0.2%	50.9%	51.3%	0.4%
		TOP THIRD TOTAL	-4.7%	35.8%	29.3%	-6.5%	58.6%	52.8%	-5.8%	53.7%	55.4%	1.7%
		MID THIRD TOTAL	-3.2%	26.5%	25.6%	-0.9%	55.3%	55.1%	-0.7%	45.1%	43.7%	-1.2%
		LOW THIRD TOTAL	4.7%	26.9%	31.2%	4.2%	52.7%	59.0%	6.2%	54.6%	55.5%	0.9%

that large percentage swings occur for only a few students; in this case, nine additional students were counted in 1984, eight of whom were below normal in reading. Metro received half of its Class of 1982 as transfers from other Chicago high schools; the outcomes of these students are generally recorded against their school of original enrollment in this study. 14 of the 21 schools with most reduced Dropout Rates lost enrollment in their entering classes, and these losses were primarily among students reading below normal. Aside from Austin (for which the data appear to represent delayed reporting), the largest enrollment declines were at Englewood (-39%), Harlan (-33%), and Tilden (-33%). At each of these schools, the decreases were primarily among students reading below normal (Englewood--90%, Harlan--77%, Tilden--89%). Ten schools actually added students reading at normal rates; Lincoln Park leading the way with 143 new students reading at or above normal. The next largest increases were at Steinmetz (46), Fenger (37), and Julian (25). All other increases in normal scoring entrants were below 10.

Thus, the picture which emerges for schools with the largest reductions in their Dropout Rates is one of declining enrollments, and loses of more below level entrants than students reading at normal rates. The result was, in the aggregate, an increase in the proportion reading at normal levels of 8%. Correspondingly, the Dropout Rates for these schools decreased by 9%. Together, the 1982 Dropout Rate for these schools had been 48%; in 1984, the rate was 39%, the systemwide Dropout Rate. However, a word of caution must be included. To the extent that schools delayed reporting outcome data on Class of 1984 students who were still actively enrolled after their classmates had graduated, these figures will be somewhat distorted. It would be expected that students entering with normal reading rates would be more likely to complete their schooling in four years, leaving a disproportionately larger percent below normal among those for whom records are delayed.

When the school by school records are examined closely, however, it becomes apparent that, among these schools with the largest decreases in Dropout Rates, changes in the reading scores of entering students is not all that was happening. Decreases in the Dropout Rates for both Below Normal and Normal scoring entrants were in evidence (about 6% for each). Among the nine schools with more than a 7% decrease in their Dropout Rates, all had sharp decreases in Dropout Rates for at least one reporting reading score category, indicating that in addition to receiving fewer students who were reading at lower levels, these schools were doing some things which helped more students to graduate. Eight of these 21 school reduced their Dropout Rates below 50% and now graduated more than those who dropped out. However, it is also possible that lower numbers of Below Level entrants allowed teachers to give more help to the remaining students in this class.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — CHANGES IN DROPOUT RATE RELATED TO CHANGES IN ENROLLMENT IN READING CATEGORIES
School Level Data

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	CHANGE OVERALL D/O RATE	1982 NORMAL ENROLL	1984 NORMAL ENROLL	CHANGE NORMAL ENROLL	% CHANGE NORMAL ENROLL	1982 BELOW ENROLL	1984 BELOW ENROLL	CHANGE BELOW ENROLL	% CHANGE BELOW ENROLL	1982 MISSING ENROLL	1984 MISSING ENROLL	CHANGE MISSING ENROLL	% CHANGE MISSING ENROLL
1	1310	Fenger	-17.0%	139	176	37	26.6%	312	215	-97	-31.1%	60	53	-7	-11.7%
2	1890	Juarez	-12.0%	104	98	-6	-5.8%	173	92	-81	-46.8%	177	157	-20	-11.3%
3	1350	Harlan	-10.6%	358	211	-147	-18.2%	331	165	-166	-50.2%	58	56	-2	-3.4%
4	1270	Crane	-9.6%	201	165	-36	-17.9%	246	176	-70	-28.5%	58	47	-11	-19.0%
5	1220	Austin *	-9.0%	162	40	-122	-75.3%	629	80	-549	-87.3%	37	30	-7	-8.0%
6	1680	Englewood	-7.8%	206	195	-11	-5.3%	318	112	-206	-64.8%	61	50	-11	-18.0%
7	1800	Metro, Chicago	-7.5%	37	38	1	2.7%	2	10	8	400.0%	1	1	0	0.0%
8	1470	Marshall	-7.2%	105	110	5	4.8%	307	311	4	1.3%	51	45	-6	-11.8%
9	1520	Roosevelt	-7.1%	215	185	-30	-14.0%	115	119	4	3.5%	72	65	-7	-9.7%
10	1620	Lincoln Park	-6.4%	96	239	143	149.0%	135	112	-23	-17.0%	29	29	0	0.0%
11	1760	King, M.L.	-6.3%	116	104	-12	-10.3%	256	219	-37	-14.5%	45	39	-6	-13.3%
12	1450	Lindblom	-5.6%	466	475	9	1.9%	9	11	2	22.2%	105	103	-2	-1.9%
13	1240	Bowen	-5.2%	218	207	-11	-5.0%	338	208	-130	-38.5%	136	124	-12	-8.8%
14	1840	Clemente	-5.2%	260	263	3	1.2%	528	395	-133	-25.2%	154	137	-17	-11.0%
15	1040	Flower Voc	-5.1%	63	66	3	4.8%	89	119	30	33.7%	18	14	-4	-22.2%
16	1030	Dunbar Voc	-5.0%	458	451	-7	-1.5%	58	24	-34	-58.6%	36	32	-4	-11.1%
17	1210	Aoundown	-4.9%	159	160	1	0.6%	127	93	-34	-26.8%	85	79	-6	-7.1%
18	1530	Schurz	-4.6%	449	390	-59	-13.1%	306	229	-77	-25.2%	101	90	-11	-10.9%
19	1870	Sullivan	-4.5%	306	331	25	8.2%	188	181	-7	-3.7%	34	29	-5	-14.7%
20	1590	Tilden	-4.5%	118	106	-12	-10.2%	304	166	-138	-45.4%	48	43	-5	-10.4%
21	1560	Steinmetz	-4.1%	287	333	46	16.0%	140	118	-22	-15.7%	71	62	-9	-12.7%
22	1390	Hyde Park	-3.3%	391	341	-50	-12.8%	219	132	-87	-39.7%	46	43	-3	-6.5%
23	1660	Curtiss	-3.0%	320	278	-42	-13.1%	206	181	-25	-12.1%	24	21	-3	-12.5%
24	1360	Harper	-2.8%	87	73	-14	-16.1%	287	197	-90	-31.4%	32	25	-7	-21.9%
25	1850	Carver	-2.6%	253	205	-48	-19.0%	250	169	-81	-32.4%	52	49	-3	-5.8%
26	1340	Gage Park *	-2.3%	205	120	-85	-41.5%	269	91	-178	-66.2%	29	26	-3	-10.3%
27	1150	Mission Voc	-2.1%	352	454	102	29.0%	83	63	-20	-24.1%	28	27	-1	-3.6%
28	1580	Taft	-2.1%	391	276	-115	-29.4%	50	51	1	2.0%	51	48	-3	-5.9%
29	1810	Young	-1.9%	338	359	21	6.2%	28	7	-21	-75.0%	173	167	-6	-3.5%
30	1070	Prosser Voc	-1.5%	274	258	-16	-5.8%	11	7	-4	-36.4%	94	88	-6	-6.4%
31	1480	Mather	-1.4%	260	180	-80	-30.8%	52	43	-9	-17.3%	54	52	-2	-3.7%
32	1540	Senn *	-1.0%	177	206	29	16.4%	239	194	-45	-18.8%	180	164	-16	-8.9%
33	1320	Robeson	-0.8%	257	241	-16	-6.2%	283	124	-159	-56.2%	49	45	-4	-8.2%
34	1250	Calumet	-0.5%	248	114	-134	-54.0%	365	175	-190	-52.1%	59	54	-5	-8.5%
35	1010	Chicago Voc.	-0.3%	800	818	18	2.3%	93	60	-33	-35.5%	50	43	-7	-14.0%
36	1400	Kelly *	-0.1%	205	156	-49	-23.9%	112	73	-39	-34.8%	95	81	-14	-14.7%
37	1440	Lane	0.4%	798	801	3	0.4%	1	2	1	100.0%	28	27	-1	-3.6%
38	1610	Von Steuben	0.8%	176	112	-64	-36.4%	101	56	-45	-44.6%	46	42	-4	-8.7%
39	1550	South Shore	1.6%	255	173	-82	-32.2%	338	196	-142	-42.0%	76	71	-5	-6.6%
40	1510	Phillips	1.6%	170	115	-55	-32.4%	495	309	-186	-37.6%	49	45	-4	-8.2%
41	1820	Curtis	1.8%	391	406	15	3.8%	153	116	-37	-24.2%	133	120	-13	-9.8%
42	1300	Farragut	2.3%	152	90	-62	-40.8%	288	185	-103	-35.8%	54	47	-7	-13.0%
43	1430	Lakeview	2.3%	181	131	-50	-27.6%	155	108	-47	-30.3%	77	73	-4	-5.2%
44	1260	Dubois	2.6%	154	203	49	31.8%	364	304	-60	-16.5%	45	41	-4	-8.9%
45	1880	Collins	2.7%	107	173	66	61.7%	250	248	-2	-0.8%	41	36	-5	-12.2%
46	1330	Forman	3.4%	166	140	-26	-15.7%	84	70	-14	-16.7%	43	39	-4	-9.3%
47	1710	Kenwood	3.5%	352	313	-39	-11.1%	87	47	-40	-46.0%	62	58	-4	-6.5%
48	1420	Kennedy	3.7%	235	197	-38	-16.2%	61	85	24	39.3%	34	33	-1	-2.9%
49	1670	Hubbard	3.8%	221	160	-61	-27.6%	67	70	3	4.5%	38	33	-5	-13.2%
50	1890	Morgan Park	4.0%	267	247	-20	-7.5%	142	117	-25	-17.6%	22	20	-2	-9.1%
51	1640	Wells	4.5%	157	114	-43	-27.4%	257	154	-103	-40.1%	105	97	-8	-7.6%
52	1110	Richards Voc	4.8%	93	84	-9	-9.7%	59	104	45	76.3%	15	14	-1	-6.7%
53	1150	Westinghouse Vo	4.8%	354	267	-87	-24.6%	51	30	-21	-41.2%	8	7	-1	-12.5%
54	1410	Kelvyn Park	4.9%	123	156	33	26.8%	132	169	37	28.0%	61	57	-4	-6.6%
55	1830	Orr	5.1%	113	120	7	6.2%	330	245	-85	-25.8%	66	58	-8	-12.1%
56	1460	Manley	5.8%	103	79	-24	-23.3%	340	222	-118	-34.7%	40	38	-2	-5.0%
57	1270	Harrison +	6.3%	88	88	0	0.0%	145	141	-4	-2.8%	53	52	-1	-1.9%
58	1230	Bogan	7.7%	241	227	-14	-5.8%	22	27	5	22.7%	29	29	0	0.0%
59	1630	Washington	7.9%	246	190	-56	-22.8%	68	71	3	4.4%	32	29	-3	-9.4%
60	1380	Hirsh	8.5%	121	112	-9	-7.4%	175	154	-21	-12.0%	24	22	-2	-8.3%
61	1970	Sullivan	10.1%	146	116	-30	-20.5%	99	95	-4	-4.0%	57	52	-5	-8.8%
62	1020	Crespler Voc	12.8%	60	44	-16	-26.7%	98	85	-13	-13.3%	16	16	0	0.0%
63	1050	Near No. Career	39.3%	19	2	-17	-89.5%	43	0	-43	-100.0%	11	11	0	0.0%
		CITYWIDE TOTAL	-2.7%	14,499	13,358	(1,141)	-7.9%	11,998	8,359	(3,639)	-30.3%	3,828	3,489	-339	-8.9%
		TOP THIRD TOTAL	-3.7%	4,423	4,343	(80)	-1.8%	4,911	3,155	(1,756)	-35.8%	1,487	1,335	(152)	-11.7%
		MID THIRD TOTAL	-3.2%	6,500	5,776	(724)	-11.1%	3,323	2,431	(1,492)	-38.0%	1,402	1,285	(117)	-11.3%
		LOW THIRD TOTAL	4.1%	3,547	3,163	(384)	-10.8%	3,029	2,546	(483)	-15.9%	879	815	(64)	-3.4%

Among the schools whose Dropout Rates worsened, only a few experienced sharp decreases in the proportion of students reading at normal rates. Richards Vocational increased its enrollment by 35 students, but had 45 more reading below normal, thus dropping its proportion of normal scoring entrants by 14%; this meant that for the Class of 1984, only 42% entered reading at or above normal rates. Nine other schools also showed decreases in the proportion reading at normal levels. These ten schools represent more than half of all schools with decreases in reading scores for entrants. The other 11 schools, in the third of all schools with increasing Dropout Rates, showed increases in the proportion with normal reading scores. Thus, they were doing more poorly with better prepared students. Most notable was Collins, with an 11% increase in the proportion reading at normal levels (still to only 38% for the Class of 1984), but whose Dropout Rate rose by 3% (to 51%). However, among the nine schools whose Dropout Rate worsened by more than 5%, only Orr had a significant rise in the proportion of entrants at normal levels. All had significant increases in Dropout Rates for at least one reading level category. For six of the nine, their 1984 Dropout Rate was over 50%. Only Bogan (18%), Washington (28%), and Sullivan (41%) had fewer Dropouts than Graduates. Enrollment decreases for these 21 schools were less sharp than for the other two-thirds of Chicago's high schools, averaging only down 12.5%. Three of these schools, Kelvyn Park, Richards Vocational, and Collins, had significant enrollment increases; Kelvyn Park and Richards absorbed some of the growth in the Northwestside Hispanic community.

The schools in the mid-range (between a 3.3% reduction in the Dropout Rate and a 2.3% increase in it) had a moderate increase in the proportion of students reading at normal levels on entry. Six had moderate declines in the proportion at normal levels. Robeson had a dramatic increase in the proportion received at normal levels (up 15%, to 59% in the Class of 1984) but the school's Dropout Rate was only slightly reduced (-0.8%) despite receiving better prepared students. However, Robeson also reported 179 fewer students, which may be the effect of the new promotion policy. In the aggregate, these schools with only minor changes in the Dropout Rate had lower than the systemwide average rate and received higher proportions of their students reading at or above normal.

In summary, it may be said that as the proportion of students reading at or above normal increases, the Dropout Rate decreases. But, if the change in reading scores is merely the one-time effect of delayed entry into high school in the year in which the policy is first implemented, that change must be considered an anomaly, and not taken as a sign of improvement in the Dropout Rate. Its effect is likely to be negative in the following year.

Individual schools varied on their capacity to capitalize on the changes in their entering students. Some, like Fenger, in addition to receiving better prepared students, also decreased the Dropout Rates for both those reading below normal and those at or above normal levels. Others, such as Robeson and Collings, seem to have done worse, even though receiving better prepared students. However, if systemwide, rather than ideosycratic, factors are considered, the correspondence between rising reading scores and falling Dropout Rates cannot be ignored. But, for significant reduction of the Dropout Rates, rising reading scores must reflect improved student performance rather than artificial changes in the composition of the entering class.

Changes in Age of Entry and Student Outcomes

When the Classes of 1982, 1983, and 1984 are compared for changes in the age of entry, there are few changes between 1982 and 1983, but major changes between 1983 and 1984, as has already been noted. The system had 2,808 (14%) fewer 14 year old entrants in the Class of 1984. The Dropout Rate for 14 year old students dropped 2%. On the school level, the pattern of change is more evident. The third of the schools which lost the largest percent of their 14 year olds, had a decrease of three percentage points in their Dropout Rate. Some large decreases in the Dropout Rate for this age (e.g., Clemente's rate dropped 13%), were offset by some increases in the Dropout Rate, particularly in previously predominantly White schools (e.g., Hubbard, Washington, and Bogan). The mid-range schools also had their Dropout Rate for 14 year olds decrease by 3%, with the largest decrease at Julian. The lowest third had 17 schools which increased their 14 year old enrollment, and their aggregate decrease in the Dropout Rate was under 1%. A number of these schools are selective in their entrance requirements (and thus, would be less susceptible to the promotion policy), others were very small and statistically more volatile, and some seemed not to be affected by the policy's implementation in their feeder schools, particularly in Districts 8 and 9.

Changes in Racial Composition and Outcomes

There were small changes in the racial composition of the classes entering high school in September 1978, 1979, and 1980. Systemwide, Blacks and Whites declined slightly, while Hispanics increased slightly. The Dropout Rates for all three groups decreased, but the changes for Whites (down 0.5%) and Blacks (-1.9%) were relatively small. The change for Hispanics (down 4.4%) was more significant. Transfer Rates for Blacks increased slightly (up 1.1% to 9.0%), for Whites decreased slightly (-1.4% to 10.5%) and stayed about even for Hispanics (at 14.4%).

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — CHANGES IN 14 YEAR OLD ENTRANTS - Rank Ordered by 1984 Change from 1983 — TABLE 28

School Level Data

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	CHANGE 83 vs 84 13-	% CHANGE 83 vs 84 13-	CHANGE 83 vs 84 14	% CHANGE 83 vs 84 14	CHANGE 83 vs 84 OVERAGE	% CHANGE 83 vs 84 OVERAGE	1982 DROP RATE 14	1983 DROP RATE 14	1984 DROP RATE 14	84 vs 83 DROP RATE 14
1	1050	Near No. Career Magn	-1	-100.0%	-135	-99.3%	-110	-98.2%	48.9%	46.3%	100.0%	53.7%
2	1220	Austin	-8	-80.0%	-358	-79.6%	-184	-80.3%	56.8%	50.2%	45.8%	-4.5%
3	1890	Juarez	-1	-11.1%	-146	-52.1%	10	5.4%	49.0%	25.4%	30.8%	5.4%
4	1250	Calumet	-4	-80.0%	-156	-51.1%	-31	-14.2%	45.5%	44.1%	44.6%	0.5%
5	1340	Onge Park	0	0.0%	-133	-44.3%	-14	-17.3%	45.1%	39.6%	38.9%	-0.7%
6	1430	Lakeview	0	0.0%	-90	-33.8%	-1	-0.8%	49.1%	50.7%	46.7%	-4.0%
7	1320	Robeson	4	28.6%	-106	-32.9%	-64	-27.6%	50.0%	50.7%	52.5%	1.8%
8	1300	Farragut	-1	-12.5%	-91	-32.2%	-20	-13.5%	48.3%	48.9%	52.0%	3.1%
9	1590	Tilden	1	25.0%	-84	-29.1%	-37	-24.0%	48.4%	47.2%	42.8%	-4.4%
10	1670	Hubbard	3	50.0%	-85	-27.9%	21	33.9%	35.1%	28.3%	34.9%	6.6%
11	1630	Washington	0	0.0%	-93	-27.7%	-10	-9.7%	18.1%	15.0%	17.8%	2.8%
12	1480	Mather	-8	-50.0%	-76	-27.1%	13	20.0%	19.4%	18.6%	16.8%	-1.9%
13	1950	South Shore	-7	-63.6%	-105	-26.0%	-8	-5.4%	48.1%	41.5%	47.8%	6.4%
14	1460	Lindblom	-10	-12.5%	-157	-24.5%	0	0.0%	21.2%	17.9%	14.0%	-3.9%
15	1860	Corliss	-16	-66.7%	-120	-24.2%	-20	-16.4%	29.9%	27.9%	24.5%	-3.4%
16	1640	Wells	0	0.0%	-50	-23.8%	27	17.6%	50.0%	51.4%	44.1%	-7.3%
17	1760	King,M.L.	-2	-40.0%	-66	-23.1%	-75	-36.9%	44.0%	45.8%	39.9%	-5.9%
18	1840	Clemente	10	90.9%	-126	-20.4%	-80	-20.2%	52.9%	51.0%	37.6%	-13.4%
19	1160	Westinghouse Voc	-14	-53.8%	-62	-18.3%	-1	-4.5%	20.1%	21.7%	24.9%	3.2%
20	1580	Taft	-6	-37.5%	-75	-17.0%	-5	-8.5%	16.7%	14.3%	12.3%	-2.0%
21	1230	Borgan	-1	-20.0%	-43	-16.6%	43	91.5%	7.7%	8.5%	10.4%	2.0%
22	1310	Farragut	1	10.0%	-58	-16.1%	1	0.7%	49.6%	40.6%	35.5%	-5.1%
23	1030	Dunbar Voc	5	18.5%	-72	-14.6%	23	54.8%	25.9%	26.0%	22.2%	-3.7%
24	1240	Bowen	-8	-50.0%	-52	-14.5%	-23	-11.0%	41.9%	35.2%	34.9%	-0.3%
25	1330	Foreman	6	ERR	-34	-14.4%	2	2.9%	34.2%	35.1%	30.8%	-4.4%
26	1710	Kenwood	20	62.5%	-65	-13.7%	-7	-10.0%	19.0%	21.5%	17.0%	-4.5%
27	1510	Phillips	1	16.7%	-42	-13.1%	-49	-20.9%	50.0%	52.8%	54.9%	2.1%
28	1490	Morgan Park	3	30.0%	-44	-12.8%	23	26.4%	21.1%	24.1%	21.4%	-2.7%
29	1610	Von Steuben	-4	-57.1%	-19	-11.9%	11	21.6%	28.4%	24.6%	26.2%	1.5%
30	1350	Harlan	-4	-33.3%	-36	-10.9%	16	18.4%	39.2%	35.0%	29.7%	-5.3%
31	1070	Prosser Voc	4	30.8%	-34	-10.9%	-5	-15.6%	21.6%	23.7%	23.8%	0.2%
32	1530	Schurz	1	11.1%	-58	-10.4%	-2	-0.9%	46.0%	39.0%	38.9%	-0.1%
33	1870	Julian	2	9.5%	-53	-10.3%	-40	-26.5%	29.1%	29.9%	19.7%	-10.1%
34	1440	Lane	15	15.6%	-102	-10.0%	-10	-22.7%	16.6%	17.2%	14.5%	-2.7%
35	1420	Kennedy	3	100.0%	-26	-8.3%	15	23.4%	25.3%	19.6%	24.1%	4.5%
36	1210	Aoundson	1	8.3%	-20	-7.6%	-8	-7.9%	42.2%	46.0%	37.3%	-8.7%
37	1360	Harper	1	25.0%	-17	-7.6%	-67	-40.9%	46.9%	54.1%	46.0%	-8.1%
38	1110	Richard Voc	3	150.0%	-10	-7.2%	13	22.0%	27.7%	35.7%	32.5%	-3.2%
39	1820	Currie	3	21.4%	-39	-6.7%	33	26.0%	24.4%	22.6%	25.0%	2.4%
40	1270	Crane	-1	-9.1%	-19	-6.6%	-78	-44.6%	53.5%	56.5%	51.5%	-5.0%
41	1830	Orr	-13	-76.5%	-14	-5.4%	-4	-2.3%	41.7%	50.0%	42.2%	-7.8%
42	1800	Collins	4	50.0%	-13	-5.1%	96	85.0%	41.5%	41.3%	33.5%	-7.8%
43	1850	Carver	17	242.9%	-7	-2.7%	1	0.6%	40.4%	44.1%	39.4%	-4.7%
44	1300	Hirsh	-2	-33.3%	-4	-2.7%	69	66.3%	41.1%	42.2%	41.5%	-0.6%
45	1560	Steinmetz	11	122.2%	-10	-2.5%	3	2.9%	31.6%	28.1%	27.2%	-0.9%
46	1520	Roosevelt	1	20.0%	-7	-2.4%	35	43.2%	49.0%	44.1%	39.7%	-4.4%
47	1390	Hyde Park	-6	-18.8%	2	0.5%	11	11.6%	34.1%	30.1%	27.2%	-2.9%
48	1460	Manley	-5	-35.7%	3	1.6%	32	28.6%	46.2%	41.9%	54.2%	12.4%
49	1810	Young	-4	-5.9%	9	2.4%	-38	-60.3%	16.9%	18.4%	14.0%	-4.4%
50	1280	DuSable	5	83.3%	8	2.7%	-1	-0.4%	50.1%	58.5%	54.5%	-4.0%
51	1400	Kelly	3	75.0%	6	2.7%	20	28.6%	50.9%	47.5%	49.1%	1.6%
52	1370	Harrison +	-4	-44.4%	5	2.7%	-15	-11.4%	40.7%	45.4%	46.2%	0.8%
53	1150	Simeon Voc	7	77.8%	13	3.0%	7	8.8%	32.3%	29.0%	29.2%	0.2%
54	1010	Chicago Voc.	9	17.6%	28	3.5%	14	17.9%	25.2%	22.6%	24.9%	2.3%
55	1540	Senn	-2	-8.0%	16	4.7%	-40	-14.4%	39.2%	38.9%	35.0%	-3.9%
56	1680	Englewood	2	28.6%	15	8.4%	-45	-25.0%	48.2%	37.1%	33.9%	-3.2%
57	1410	Kelvyn	2	40.0%	21	11.1%	61	46.6%	42.2%	48.8%	40.3%	-8.5%
58	1570	Sullivan	1	14.3%	20	12.0%	12	19.0%	33.3%	30.1%	41.1%	11.0%
59	1470	Marshall	4	30.8%	37	14.8%	-3	-1.9%	49.2%	37.4%	43.1%	5.7%
60	1020	Crosier Voc	-3	-60.0%	13	16.5%	4	7.7%	41.7%	49.3%	64.6%	15.2%
61	1040	Flower Voc	-6	-60.0%	31	25.6%	-3	-5.6%	40.7%	37.9%	35.2%	-2.8%
62	1800	Metro, Chicago	-2	-66.7%	12	35.3%	1	12.5%	43.6%	29.0%	27.0%	-2.0%
63	1620	Lincoln Park	0	0.0%	108	64.3%	45	58.2%	46.1%	44.7%	31.9%	-12.7%
		SYSTEMWIDE TOTALS	31	3.4%	(2,808)	-13.6%	(205)	-2.6%	37.0%	33.8%	31.7%	-2.1%
		TOP THIRD TOTALS	(61)	-22.8%	(2,362)	-32.5%	(546)	-18.9%	39.1%	34.3%	31.1%	-3.2%
		MID THIRD TOTALS	43	13.0%	(828)	-10.6%	(60)	-2.5%	34.2%	32.0%	28.9%	-3.2%
		LOW THIRD TOTALS	28	9.2%	319	5.7%	170	7.3%	38.1%	35.4%	34.7%	-0.7%

But there were significant changes in the entering classes of individual high schools. Differences for Blacks were minimal, though the percent attending schools in which there were less than a majority Blacks nearly doubled, from 7% in the Class of 1982 to 12% in the Class of 1984. Still 74% of all Blacks went to all-Black high schools, and another 14% went to majority Black schools. But for Hispanics and Whites, there were some significant changes. In the Class of 1984, 57% of all Hispanics attended high schools with a majority of Hispanics in the entering class. The percent attending schools whose entering class was 25%-49% Hispanic declined by 10%. The opposite phenomenon was true for Whites. The percent attending schools whose entering class was two-thirds White was cut in half (from 49% to 24%). The percent attending schools with more than a third White in the entering class rose from 42% to 60%, and those in schools with less than a third Whites rose from 9% to 15%. Thus, Hispanics increasingly tended to enter schools with other Hispanics, while Whites, more and more, found themselves entering schools with persons of other races.

This change was most noticeable with the Class of 1984. In the fall of 1980, as the Class of 1984 was enrolling in high school, the Board of Education and the United States Department of Justice entered into a consent decree to eliminate the racial isolation of Whites in the Chicago Public Schools. It is evident that the planning for desegregation had some impact on freshman enrollments for the Class of 1984. However, it had much greater impact on entering freshmen in the succeeding classes. This change had some impact on members of the Classes of 1983 and 1984, for in a number of schools, the racial composition changed significantly while they were enrolled. Data to describe these changes were taken from the annual Racial Census of the Chicago Public Schools.

The Racial Census for the six years from October 1978 to October 1983 (the entering fall of the Class of 1982 to the senior year of the Class of 1984) showed some significant systemwide racial changes. Overall, enrollment declined by 21%. The percentage of White students decreased 7%, with most of the increase in the Hispanic community (up 5%). Five schools gained more than 10% in enrollment: Near North Career Magnet (110%, more than doubling in size), Lincoln Park (47%, reflecting the new baccalaureate program), Kelvyn Park (20%) and Juarez (17%), reflecting increases in the Northwestside and Southwestside Hispanic communities, and Kenwood (15%). Five other schools increased by less than 2.5%. One school closed (Harrison, whose students were transferred to Farragut). Fourteen others lost more than a third of their students; all but Lakeview were inner city all-Black schools. Austin (57%) and Calumet (53%) lost more than half of their enrollment during this period.

DROPOUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

School Level Data

RACIAL CENSUS COMPARISONS

RACIALLY CHANGING SCHOOLS - RACIAL CENSUS DATA - Rank Order by 1978-79 White

TABLE 29

UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	1978-79 ENROLLED	CHANGE ENROLLED 78 - 83	PERCENT CHANGE ENROLLED	1978-79 WHITE	1978-79 BLACK	1978-79 AMER IND	1978-79 ASIAN	1978-79 HISP	WHITE CHANGE 78 - 83	BLACK CHANGE 78 - 83	AMER IND CHANGE 78 - 83	ASIAN CHANGE 78 - 83	HISP CHANGE 78 - 83
1230	Bogan	15	Gen	2,155	(303)	-14.1%	98.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.8%	-46.5%	28.5%	0.6%	1.6%	15.8%
1330	Foreman	4	Gen	1,584	(247)	-15.6%	89.2%	0.1%	0.1%	1.6%	9.0%	-45.4%	39.7%	-0.1%	0.2%	5.7%
1670	Hubbard	15	Gen	1,863	(684)	-36.7%	91.6%	1.0%	0.1%	1.3%	6.0%	-36.2%	23.3%	-0.1%	-0.7%	13.7%
1420	Kennedy	12	Gen	2,088	(534)	-25.6%	84.2%	13.3%	0.1%	3.1%	2.3%	-31.9%	21.4%	-0.1%	-3.0%	10.6%
1630	Washington	20	Gen	1,991	(253)	-12.7%	89.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	9.5%	-31.4%	11.2%	0.1%	0.2%	19.8%
1560	Steinmetz	4	Gen	2,470	(347)	-14.0%	86.0%	8.3%	0.2%	1.4%	4.2%	-31.3%	20.6%	-0.2%	2.0%	8.7%
1540	Taft	1	Gen	2,898	(908)	-31.3%	95.7%	2.7%	0.1%	0.6%	0.9%	-26.9%	19.8%	0.3%	3.1%	3.8%
1570	Sullivan	2	Gen	1,396	(439)	-31.4%	55.0%	24.1%	0.1%	10.6%	10.1%	-26.6%	18.7%	0.8%	-1.0%	8.0%
1220	Curie	12	Gen	3,247	6	0.2%	67.2%	21.7%	0.0%	0.5%	10.7%	-25.9%	1.7%	0.1%	2.4%	21.6%
1070	Prosser Voc	4	Voc	1,492	(141)	-9.5%	66.2%	16.8%	0.1%	1.2%	16.6%	-25.2%	12.4%	0.0%	-0.1%	13.0%
1530	Schurz	4	Gen	3,922	(810)	-20.7%	67.2%	2.4%	0.3%	2.1%	28.0%	-24.6%	9.7%	0.0%	0.2%	14.7%
1520	Roosevelt	1	Gen	1,831	(152)	-8.3%	73.2%	4.0%	0.2%	9.3%	13.2%	-22.3%	4.8%	0.3%	5.5%	11.8%
1110	Richardis Voé	11	Voc	800	(14)	-1.8%	28.3%	26.5%	0.0%	0.4%	44.9%	-20.8%	20.8%	0.1%	0.4%	-0.7%
1620	Oregler Voc	9	Voc	1,010	(302)	-29.9%	19.5%	80.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	-19.5%	19.9%	0.0%	-0.1%	-0.3%
1410	Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	1,510	304	20.1%	36.4%	2.1%	0.2%	1.9%	59.4%	-18.2%	2.3%	-0.1%	-0.8%	16.8%
1480	Mather	2	Gen	1,699	(67)	-3.9%	80.2%	7.4%	0.1%	9.4%	2.9%	-17.2%	8.4%	0.1%	5.1%	3.6%
1210	Amundsen	2	Gen	1,718	(309)	-18.0%	73.7%	1.7%	0.4%	7.9%	16.3%	-16.8%	4.4%	0.1%	2.8%	9.6%
1400	Kelly *	8	Gen	2,139	(417)	-19.5%	74.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	24.8%	-15.1%	0.8%	0.1%	0.5%	13.0%
1900	Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	382	1	0.3%	26.0%	60.2%	1.2%	0.3%	12.3%	-14.6%	15.0%	-0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
1440	Lane	3	Tech	4,516	99	2.2%	58.1%	9.6%	0.5%	10.8%	11.0%	-13.1%	3.7%	-0.2%	5.1%	4.6%
1540	Senn *	2	Gen	2,536	(79)	-3.1%	65.6%	21.5%	2.7%	17.2%	23.0%	-11.7%	3.0%	-0.3%	7.2%	1.8%
1490	Morgan Park	18	Gen	2,270	(409)	-18.0%	40.7%	58.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.8%	-11.1%	10.5%	0.0%	-0.2%	0.9%
1450	Lakeview	3	Gen	1,955	(783)	-40.1%	35.8%	6.7%	0.6%	5.8%	51.2%	-10.1%	11.5%	0.0%	-1.3%	-0.2%
1370	Harrison *	8	Gen	1,337	(1,337)	-100.0%	5.2%	42.6%	0.0%	0.3%	51.7%	-5.2%	-42.6%	0.0%	-0.3%	-51.7%
1130	Farragut	10	Gen	2,741	(786)	-28.6%	1.2%	80.5%	0.0%	0.2%	18.1%	-0.4%	-26.8%	0.0%	-0.2%	27.4%
1240	Bowen	19	Gen	3,207	(955)	-29.8%	2.0%	61.1%	0.0%	0.0%	36.8%	-1.3%	-9.9%	0.2%	0.0%	11.2%
1050	Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	489	537	109.8%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.4%	-17.9%	0.3%	3.5%	8.8%
1420	Lincoln Park	3	Gen	1,083	509	47.0%	6.2%	74.2%	0.0%	0.6%	19.0%	27.8%	-25.3%	0.0%	3.7%	-6.1%

		ENROLLED	CHANGE	% CHANGE	WHITE	BLACK	AMER IND	ASIAN	HISP	WHITE	BLACK	AMER IND	ASIAN	HISP
Racial survey total numbers (reg, sp and voc hs)	total	140,549	(28,992)	-20.6%	25.6%	50.2%	0.1%	1.8%	12.3%	-6.6%	0.5%	0.1%	1.1%	4.9%

DROPOUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

School Level Data

TRIAD COMPARISON - WHITES

WHITE OUTCOMES - Schools Ranked by Change in White Enrollment

TABLE 30

SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	1982 ENTERING FRESHMEN	1983 ENTERING FRESHMEN	1984 ENTERING FRESHMEN	CHANGE ENTERING FRESHMEN	1982 PERCENT WHITE ENROLLED	1983 PERCENT WHITE ENROLLED	1984 PERCENT WHITE ENROLLED	CHANGE PERCENT WHITE ENROLLED	1982 PERCENT WHITE DROPOUT	1983 PERCENT WHITE DROPOUT	1984 PERCENT WHITE DROPOUT	CHANGE PERCENT WHITE DROPOUT
Hubbard	15	Gen	319	357	312	(7)	86.5%	86.0%	65.1%	-21.5%	38.3%	31.1%	37.2%	-1.7%
Foreman	4	Gen	288	302	280	(8)	85.8%	82.1%	66.1%	-19.7%	34.3%	40.3%	38.5%	3.6%
Schurz	4	Gen	329	794	736	(93)	64.4%	54.4%	47.8%	-16.6%	48.4%	44.4%	49.3%	1.0%
Steinmetz	4	Gen	485	516	520	35	75.3%	74.6%	62.7%	-13.2%	34.7%	35.8%	32.5%	-2.1%
Washington	20	Gen	338	443	341	3	85.2%	82.6%	72.4%	-12.8%	21.7%	18.9%	19.5%	-2.1%
Richardis Voc	11	Voc	159	195	205	46	27.7%	21.0%	15.6%	-12.1%	41.5%	54.9%	70.8%	29.4%
Curie	12	Gen	662	716	719	57	58.9%	54.9%	47.6%	-11.3%	20.3%	28.0%	31.2%	10.9%
Amundsen	2	Gen	356	376	349	(7)	77.2%	69.9%	66.2%	-11.1%	47.1%	51.8%	41.9%	-5.2%
Kennedy	12	Gen	329	382	374	45	76.0%	75.7%	65.5%	-10.5%	25.6%	17.2%	20.3%	-5.4%
Roosevelt	1	Gen	392	378	407	15	68.4%	63.8%	58.0%	-10.4%	52.6%	52.3%	48.0%	-4.6%
Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	40	44	56	16	30.0%	31.8%	19.6%	-10.4%	36.4%	18.2%	50.0%	13.6%
Senn *	2	Gen	548	571	609	61	35.6%	0.2%	26.3%	-9.3%	42.8%	100.0%	48.9%	6.1%
Lakeview	3	Gen	406	357	308	(98)	41.9%	40.6%	33.4%	-8.4%	59.6%	54.1%	68.2%	8.6%
Taft	1	Gen	489	501	444	(45)	91.8%	90.2%	84.2%	-7.6%	16.4%	15.3%	13.9%	-2.5%
Morgan Park	18	Gen	426	440	422	(4)	36.6%	37.0%	29.4%	-7.2%	20.1%	28.1%	25.0%	4.9%
Prosser Voc	4	Voc	373	358	323	(50)	54.4%	47.8%	48.3%	-6.1%	25.4%	33.8%	20.8%	4.4%
Bogan	15	Gen	291	313	335	44	96.6%	96.2%	91.3%	-5.2%	10.3%	10.5%	16.6%	6.5%
Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	312	325	409	97	33.3%	32.9%	28.1%	-5.2%	+9.4%	66.6%	59.6%	10.2%
Sullivan	2	Gen	291	276	270	(21)	45.0%	44.5%	40.7%	-4.3%	33.7%	45.5%	43.6%	10.0%
Mather	2	Gen	360	358	289	(71)	75.3%	69.8%	71.6%	-3.7%	19.8%	19.6%	18.7%	-1.1%
Oregler Voc	9	Voc	174	136	150	(24)	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	-1.1%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR
Kelly *	8	Gen	355	296	325	(30)	72.4%	77.0%	75.1%	2.7%	52.1%	52.2%	55.4%	3.3%
Lane	3	Tech	825	1,162	1,065	240	66.1%	62.3%	66.5%	-0.5%	12.8%	18.6%	16.2%	3.4%
Harrison *	8	Gen	283	323	309	26	4.9%	5.6%	5.8%	0.9%	60.0%	72.7%	56.3%	-3.7%
Farragut	10	Gen	487	427	327	(160)	1.0%	0.9%	2.4%	1.4%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%
Bowen	19	Gen	674	584	501	(173)	1.6%	1.7%	1.0%	-0.6%	72.7%	50.0%	50.0%	-22.7%
Near No. Career Magn	3	Vo	73	287	3	(70)	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	50.0%	ERR	ERR
Lincoln Park	3	Gen	257	261	413	156	9.3%	20.7%	22.3%	12.9%	89.5%	61.1%	29.6%	-59.9%
TOTAL CHANGING SCHOOLS			10,821	11,448	10,801	(20)	53.3%	50.1%	47.5%	-5.8%	31.4%	31.6%	31.8%	0.2%
TOTAL - MORE THAN 10% CHANGE			9,047	9,596	9,248	201	63.2%	58.8%	54.1%	-9.0%	31.2%	31.2%	31.6%	0.4%

Of the 63 regular high schools, 28 experienced significant racial change during this period. 23 of these schools experienced White enrollment declines of more than 10%, led by Bogan, whose White percentage was nearly cut in half (from 98% White to 52% White). All of the other predominantly White high schools of 1978 experienced sharp declines in White proportions. With the exceptions of Curie, Prosser Voc., Roosevelt, Richards Voc., and Mather, these declines occurred amid sharply declining enrollments. At these five named schools, enrollments held fairly steady, with minorities replacing decreases in White enrollments. At three schools, racial change primarily involved minorities. Harrison closed and Farragut absorbed most of its students, a change which primarily affected Blacks and Hispanics (Farragut ended up 54% Black, 46% Hispanic). Bowen shifted towards an even distribution, as it lost more Blacks than Hispanics. The Near North Career Magnet more than doubled in size, going from all-Black to 18% White, Asian, and Hispanic. Lincoln Park, adding a baccalaureate program, increased its enrollment by half, lifting its White enrollment to nearly one third. However, in-school segregation of this program may mitigate the apparent gain in racial interaction.

The Dropout Rates for Whites in schools which, for the Class of 1982, had more than two-thirds of their entrants who were White decreased at all schools except Bogan (up 7%), Foreman (up 4%), and Kelly (up 3%). Among the schools which had been more than a third White, Dropout Rates for Whites uniformly increased, except for Gage Park (down 3%). The largest increases were at Curie (up 11%, to 31%), Kelvyn Park (up 10%, to 60%), and Sullivan (up 10%, to 44%). Among the schools less than a third White in the entering Class of 1982, some wild alterations took place. Lincoln Park's White Dropout Rate dropped 60% (from 90% to 30%) as the school went from 6% White to 34% White, and the Whites who were attracted were from a higher socio-economic class. In the same area, the old Cooley High became the Near North Career Magnet, with an almost completely new student body, thus explaining the few entering students for the Class of 1984. Meanwhile, at Richards Vocational, the White proportion of the entering class declined from 28% to 16% and the White Dropout Rate soared by 29% to 71% of all Whites.

Overall, Black Dropout Rates decreased by 2%. The decreases were largest in the all-Black schools, where the aggregate reduction in the Dropout Rate was 4%, and in the majority Black schools, where the rate dropped 3%. However, these are the schools which were most affected by the new promotion/retention policy which affected the Class of 1984. The Dropout Rate rose for schools with more than a 10% Black minority (4%), but declined sharply for students in entering classes less than 10% Black.

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — BLACK OUTCOMES - Schools Ranked by Change in Black Enrollment — TABLE 31

School Level Data

TREND COMPARISON - BLACKS

SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	1982 ENTERING FRESHMEN	1983 ENTERING FRESHMEN	1984 ENTERING FRESHMEN	CHANGE ENTERING FRESHMEN	1982 PERCENT BLACK ENROLLED	1983 PERCENT BLACK ENROLLED	1984 PERCENT BLACK ENROLLED	CHANGE PERCENT BLACK ENROLLED	1982 PERCENT BLACK DROPOUT	1983 PERCENT BLACK DROPOUT	1984 PERCENT BLACK DROPOUT	CHANGE PERCENT BLACK DROPOUT
Richards Voc	11	Voc	159	195	205	46	25.2%	31.3%	46.8%	21.7%	26.3%	39.3%	37.8%	11.6%
Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	40	NA	56	16	57.5%	54.5%	78.6%	21.1%	33.3%	37.5%	25.0%	-8.3%
Hubbard	15	Gen	319	357	312	(7)	2.2%	5.9%	22.1%	19.9%	33.3%	52.3%	54.2%	20.9%
Foreman	4	Gen	288	302	280	(8)	1.0%	4.0%	18.2%	17.2%	0.0%	36.4%	34.7%	34.7%
Tuley	4	Gen	829	794	736	(93)	3.4%	10.6%	14.2%	11.4%	54.2%	50.0%	46.3%	-7.9%
Zeimetz	4	Gen	485	516	520	35	15.5%	16.1%	25.0%	9.5%	36.1%	23.8%	30.0%	-6.1%
Prosser Voc	4	Voc	373	358	323	(50)	22.3%	27.7%	30.0%	7.8%	14.5%	15.6%	17.2%	2.8%
Morgan Park	18	Gen	426	440	422	(4)	62.4%	62.5%	69.7%	7.2%	27.2%	28.2%	30.0%	2.9%
Kennedy	12	Gen	329	352	374	45	21.3%	19.6%	28.3%	7.0%	44.6%	43.5%	51.9%	7.3%
Dart	1	Gen	489	501	NAA	(45)	6.1%	7.0%	11.9%	5.8%	28.6%	43.3%	31.3%	2.7%
Washington	20	Gen	338	443	341	3	0.3%	2.3%	4.7%	4.4%	0.0%	14.3%	35.7%	35.7%
Sullivan	2	Gen	291	236	270	(21)	30.9%	29.2%	34.2%	3.3%	43.7%	44.6%	48.8%	5.1%
Roosevelt	1	Gen	392	378	407	15	6.4%	7.7%	9.1%	2.7%	56.0%	33.3%	60.0%	4.0%
Harlan	15	Gen	291	313	335	NA	0.0%	0.6%	1.8%	1.8%	ERR	0.0%	16.7%	ERR
Amundsen	2	Gen	356	376	349	(7)	4.5%	4.3%	6.0%	1.5%	51.5%	53.3%	43.8%	-17.8%
Senn *	2	Gen	548	571	609	61	19.5%	18.7%	20.0%	0.5%	52.6%	49.8%	45.5%	-7.1%
Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	312	325	409	97	1.0%	0.6%	1.5%	0.5%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	-20.0%
Crispler Voc	9	Voc	174	136	150	(24)	98.3%	99.3%	99.3%	0.5%	50.0%	57.1%	71.2%	11.2%
Kelly *	8	Gen	355	296	325	(30)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Mather	2	Gen	360	358	289	(71)	9.7%	9.8%	9.3%	-0.4%	37.5%	45.2%	34.8%	-2.7%
Curie	12	Gen	662	716	719	57	28.6%	22.6%	23.6%	-1.1%	33.6%	29.5%	29.6%	-4.0%
Lane	3	Tech	825	1,162	1,065	240	10.9%	13.2%	9.0%	-1.9%	19.5%	19.1%	18.8%	-0.7%
Lakeview	3	Gen	406	397	308	(98)	10.1%	11.1%	6.8%	-3.3%	64.5%	73.0%	77.8%	13.3%
Marshall	10	Gen	487	437	327	(160)	76.4%	79.4%	81.3%	5.0%	53.2%	55.7%	58.4%	5.2%
Lincoln Park	3	Gen	257	261	413	156	65.8%	46.4%	59.1%	-6.7%	42.8%	44.7%	48.0%	5.2%
Owen	19	Gen	674	584	501	(173)	59.6%	47.1%	47.3%	-12.3%	53.1%	45.3%	49.8%	-3.3%
Harrison +	8	Gen	283	323	309	26	37.1%	28.5%	21.0%	-16.1%	40.2%	46.4%	45.8%	5.7%
Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	73	247	3	(70)	100.0%	88.7%	33.3%	-66.7%	62.5%	60.1%	100.0%	37.5%
TOTALS CHANGING SCHOOLS			10,821	11,448	10,801	(20)	23.0%	22.9%	24.3%	1.3%	43.3%	42.7%	43.2%	-0.7%
TOTALS -10% WHITE (CENSUS)			9,047	9,596	9,248	201	15.2%	16.5%	19.6%	4.5%	38.1%	36.5%	39.2%	1.2%
TOTALS OTHERS			1,774	1,852	1,553	(221)	53.2%	56.2%	52.4%	-10.8%	50.3%	51.3%	51.8%	0.5%

DROP OUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — HISPANIC OUTCOMES - Racially Changing Schools by Percent Hispanic, 1982 — TABLE 32

School Level Data

TREND COMPARISON - HISPANICS

SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	1982 ENTERING FRESHMEN	1983 ENTERING FRESHMEN	1984 ENTERING FRESHMEN	CHANGE ENTERING FRESHMEN	1982 PERCENT HISPANIC ENROLLED	1983 PERCENT HISPANIC ENROLLED	1984 PERCENT HISPANIC ENROLLED	CHANGE PERCENT HISPANIC ENROLLED	1982 PERCENT HISPANIC DROPOUT	1983 PERCENT HISPANIC DROPOUT	1984 PERCENT HISPANIC DROPOUT	CHANGE PERCENT HISPANIC DROPOUT
Kelvyn Park	5	Gen	312	325	409	97	63.5%	63.7%	68.5%	5.5%	41.3%	47.8%	44.7%	3.4%
Richards Voc #	12	Voc	159	195	205	46	47.2%	47.2%	37.6%	-9.6%	29.4%	34.6%	27.9%	-1.5%
Lakeview	3	Gen	406	397	308	(98)	41.1%	43.6%	53.3%	12.3%	44.1%	54.7%	46.6%	2.5%
Tuley	4	Gen	829	794	736	(93)	29.2%	32.6%	34.8%	5.6%	53.9%	46.6%	45.7%	-8.2%
Kelly *	8	Gen	355	296	325	(30)	26.8%	21.3%	28.9%	-1.8%	39.5%	46.2%	41.4%	2.0%
Senn *	2	Gen	548	571	609	61	21.5%	0.4%	28.5%	7.1%	38.5%	0.0%	40.8%	2.3%
Prosser Voc	4	Voc	373	358	323	(50)	21.2%	22.3%	19.8%	-1.4%	18.6%	19.4%	14.8%	-3.8%
Curie	12	Gen	662	716	719	57	15.0%	20.9%	27.1%	12.2%	42.2%	22.3%	26.2%	-16.0%
Roosevelt	1	Gen	392	378	407	15	14.8%	18.5%	21.6%	6.8%	54.3%	45.2%	37.3%	-17.0%
Sullivan	2	Gen	291	236	270	(21)	13.4%	17.8%	14.8%	1.4%	30.8%	22.6%	39.4%	8.6%
Washington	20	Gen	338	443	341	3	13.3%	14.2%	21.7%	8.4%	22.7%	35.3%	29.7%	7.0%
Foreman	4	Gen	288	302	280	(8)	12.2%	12.6%	13.6%	1.4%	44.4%	27.8%	34.4%	-10.1%
Lane	3	Tech	825	1,162	1,065	240	10.7%	12.1%	11.5%	0.8%	22.5%	19.5%	13.2%	-9.3%
Metro, Chicago	11	Gen	40	NA	56	16	10.0%	9.1%	1.8%	-8.2%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	-25.0%
Hubbard	15	Gen	319	357	312	(7)	9.7%	7.3%	11.8%	2.1%	53.8%	43.5%	53.6%	-0.3%
Amundsen	2	Gen	356	376	349	(7)	9.3%	16.8%	16.6%	7.3%	32.0%	49.1%	43.8%	11.8%
Zeimetz	4	Gen	485	516	520	35	4.3%	6.6%	7.3%	3.0%	33.3%	32.3%	17.1%	-16.2%
Harlan	15	Gen	291	313	335	NA	3.1%	2.6%	5.7%	2.6%	11.1%	14.3%	47.1%	35.9%
Mather	2	Gen	360	358	289	(71)	2.8%	5.7%	5.9%	3.1%	12.5%	27.3%	21.4%	8.9%
Kennedy	12	Gen	329	352	374	45	2.1%	4.2%	4.5%	2.4%	28.6%	54.5%	56.3%	27.7%
Dart	1	Gen	489	501	NAA	(45)	1.4%	1.0%	1.6%	0.1%	28.6%	0.0%	33.3%	4.8%
Morgan Park	18	Gen	426	440	422	(4)	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	.0%	66.7%	ERR	33.3%	-33.3%
Crispler Voc	9	Voc	174	136	150	(24)	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	ERR	100.0%	100.0%	ERR
Owen	19	Gen	674	584	501	(173)	38.6%	50.7%	51.3%	12.7%	39.3%	36.3%	29.2%	-0.7%
Lincoln Park	3	Gen	257	261	413	156	23.3%	20.3%	13.8%	-9.5%	57.4%	41.5%	46.3%	-10.5%
Marshall	10	Gen	487	437	327	(160)	22.4%	19.5%	15.0%	-7.4%	50.4%	59.3%	66.0%	5.6%
Harrison +	8	Gen	283	323	309	26	57.6%	59.3%	73.1%	15.5%	50.4%	54.3%	53.0%	2.6%
Near No. Career Magn	3	Voc	73	247	3	(70)	0.0%	5.7%	33.3%	33.3%	ERR	54.2%	100.0%	ERR
TOTAL CHANGING SCHOOLS			10,821	11,448	10,801	(20)	19.0%	19.5%	22.4%	3.4%	42.0%	41.3%	39.2%	-2.8%
TOTAL -10% CHANGE (CENSUS)			9,047	9,596	9,248	201	16.2%	16.2%	19.8%	3.6%	39.4%	38.7%	36.5%	-2.8%
TOTAL - OTHERS			1,774	1,852	1,553	(221)	33.4%	36.3%	38.0%	4.6%	48.2%	47.5%	47.5%	-0.7%

Individual school rates varied more significantly than these aggregate statistics. Among the all-Black schools, sharp reductions in the Dropout Rate were experienced by Fenger (-16%), Englewood (-11%), and Harlan (-10%). The Dropout Rate rose sharply at Cregier Vocational (+11%) and Hirsh (+10%). Among the majority Black schools, the changes were more moderate with the largest decrease at Metro (-8%) and the largest increase at Orr (+9%). Among the minority Black schools, three had major increases in the Black Dropout Rate: Wells (+14%), Lakeview (+13%), and Richards Vocational (+12%). The largest decrease in the Black Dropout Rate was at Senn (-7%). The largest changes occurred among the schools which had enrolled less than 10% Black entrants in the Class of 1982. By 1980 (for the Class of 1984), four of these twelve schools now had more than 10% Black entrants, and two others had 9%. For these schools with rapid increases in the proportion of entering Black students, the change in the Dropout Rate is deceptive, since for many of them, the number of entering Blacks in the Class of 1982 was so small that proportions were nearly meaningless for comparisons. At two of the four schools with more than 10% entering Blacks in the Class of 1984, the Black Dropout Rate was about a third (Taft--31%, Foreman--35%), but was considerably higher at the other two (Schurz--46%, Hubbard--54%).

Hispanic Dropout Rates also declined significantly between the Class of 1982 and 1984, with the largest reductions in the schools more than 25% Hispanic (-9%) and more than 50% Hispanic (-6%). Once again, these are the students most likely to have been affected by the new promotion policy. By the Class of 1984, 57% of all entering Hispanic students went to the five majority Hispanic schools (including Harrison, which closed before the students entering there could graduate). The Dropout Rate declined at the two most heavily Hispanic schools, Juarez (95% Hispanic, Dropout Rate down 5%) and Clemente (79% Hispanic, Rate down 5%), but rose at the other three schools, Harrison, Wells, and Kelvyn Park (Rate up 3% at each). Among the six schools enrolling more than 25% Hispanics but less than a majority, the Dropout Rate declined sharply for Schurz (-8%) but changed only marginally at the other schools. Among the schools between 5% and 24% Hispanic in the entering class, sharp reductions of the Dropout Rate occurred at Tilden (-25%), Roosevelt (-17%), Curie (-16%), Lincoln Park (-11%), and Foreman (-10%). Large increases were reported at Von Steuben (+12%) and Amundsen (+11%). Proportional changes in the Hispanic Dropout Rate for schools with less than 5% Hispanic entrants are statistically insignificant, due to the few students involved.

In the aggregate, no significant changes in Dropout Rates were found, when the schools which experienced rapid racial change during the years when the students of the Classes of 1982 - 1984 were enrolled were examined. The most dramatic

racial changes happened at Cregier Vocational, which lost all of its White students during this period, Richards Vocational, which lost three-fourths of its White students, and Metro, which lost more than half of its White students. Thus, for all three of these schools, White Dropout Rates for the Class of 1984 largely reflected Dropout Rates for students transferring within the Chicago system, which has already been identified as a high risk situation. Cregier received no White entrants for the Class of 1984; the Dropout Rate for Richards' Whites rose 26% and for Metro, by 14%. Richards, however, showed the expected pattern of White flight as its Transfer Rate out of the Chicago system jumped 18% to 25%. But at the other schools experiencing significant decreases in White enrollment, White Dropout Rates changed more than 10% at only three schools: Curie, Kelvyn Park, and Sullivan. Except for Richards, transfers out of the system stayed about even or declined for these schools experiencing rapid racial change. For all these schools, even including Richards, the White Transfer Rate declined by one percent. At Bogan, the school where parents had been most vocally opposed to desegregation, the White enrollment percentage dropped 47%, but the White Transfer Rate was cut in half, from an already low 8% to 3%, and the White Dropout Rate increased moderately, up 6.5% to 17%, still one of the lowest rates in the system.

Somewhat contrary to expectations, Black Dropout Rates increased slightly at schools which were becoming less predominant hite. At a few schools, large increases in Black entering freshmen in the Class of 1984 resulted in large increases in Black Dropout Rates: Hubbard increased from 2% to 22% entering Black freshmen and the Dropout Rate rose from 33% to 54%. Foreman went from 1% to 18% Black entrants, and their Dropout Rate rose to 35%. In both of these cases, however, the Class of 1982 numbers were so small that changes in proportions are misleadingly exaggerated. At Lakeview, the proportion of Blacks in the entering class for 1984 actually dropped, while the racial census for Blacks was trebling. The Black Dropout Rate for this smaller group of Black entrants rose 13%. No schools, with any significant number of Black entrants, in this group of racially changing schools had decreases in the Black Dropout Rate of more than 10%, though both Metro and Schurz reduced their rates by 8%.

For Hispanics, larger changes were experienced. Overall, Hispanic Dropout Rates declined for these racially changing schools by about 3%. At some schools with more than 10% Hispanic entrants, the declines were quite large: Roosevelt (-17%), Curie (-16%), and Foreman (-10%). At all three of these schools the Hispanic Dropout Rate was under 38%, considerably below the systemwide Hispanic rate. At none of these schools did the Hispanic Dropout Rate increase by more than 10%. The largest rises in the Dropout Rate at racially changing schools were at Sullivan (+9%) and Washington (+7%). The extent of the effect of the new promotion policies for the Class of 1984 on these particular schools is unknown.

SCOPE AND STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DROPOUT RATES - Schools Ranked by Percent White Entering Class

TABLE 33

School Level Data

TREND COMPARISON - WHITES			1982	1983	1984	CHANGE	1982	1983	1984	CHANGE	1982	1983	1984	CHANGE
SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	ENTERING FRESHMEN	ENTERING FRESHMEN	ENTERING FRESHMEN	ENTERING FRESHMEN	PERCENT WHITE ENROLLED	PERCENT WHITE ENROLLED	PERCENT WHITE ENROLLED	PERCENT WHITE ENROLLED	PERCENT WHITE DROPOUT	PERCENT WHITE DROPOUT	PERCENT WHITE DROPOUT	PERCENT WHITE DROPOUT
Agas	15	Gen	291	313	335	44	96.6%	96.2%	91.3%	-5.2%	10.0%	10.9%	16.6%	6.5%
Burt	1	Gen	489	501	444	(45)	91.6%	90.2%	84.2%	-7.6%	16.4%	15.3%	13.9%	-2.5%
Hancock	15	Gen	319	357	312	(7)	86.5%	86.0%	66.1%	-21.5%	38.8%	31.1%	37.2%	-1.7%
Forrest	4	Gen	358	302	350	(8)	85.8%	82.1%	66.1%	-19.7%	34.7%	40.3%	38.5%	3.8%
Washington	20	Gen	338	443	341	3	85.2%	82.6%	72.4%	-12.8%	21.7%	18.3%	19.5%	-2.1%
Madison	2	Gen	356	376	349	(7)	77.2%	69.7%	66.2%	-11.1%	47.1%	51.2%	41.9%	-5.2%
Kennedy	12	Gen	329	382	374	45	76.0%	75.7%	65.5%	-10.5%	25.6%	17.2%	20.3%	-5.4%
Lincoln	4	Gen	485	516	520	35	75.9%	74.6%	62.7%	-13.2%	34.7%	35.8%	32.5%	-2.1%
Tilden	2	Gen	360	358	289	(71)	75.3%	69.8%	71.6%	-3.7%	19.8%	19.6%	18.7%	-1.1%
Gully *	1	Gen	355	298	325	(30)	72.4%	77.0%	75.1%	2.7%	52.1%	52.2%	55.4%	3.3%
Roosevelt	1	Gen	392	378	407	15	68.4%	63.3%	58.0%	-10.4%	52.6%	52.3%	48.0%	-4.6%
Lane	1	Tech	825	1,152	1,065	240	66.1%	62.3%	65.5%	-0.5%	12.8%	18.6%	16.2%	3.4%
Schurz	4	Gen	829	794	736	(93)	64.4%	54.4%	47.8%	-16.6%	48.4%	44.4%	49.5%	1.0%
Farragut	12	Gen	562	716	719	57	58.9%	54.8%	47.8%	-11.1%	20.3%	28.0%	31.2%	10.9%
Prosser Voc	4	Voc	373	358	323	(50)	54.4%	47.2%	48.3%	-6.1%	35.4%	33.8%	30.8%	4.4%
Von Steuben	1	Gen	317	217	205	(112)	47.6%	53.9%	48.3%	0.7%	30.0%	31.3%	35.1%	5.1%
Sullivan	2	Gen	291	236	270	(21)	45.0%	44.5%	40.7%	-4.3%	33.7%	45.3%	43.6%	10.0%
Lindblom	3	Gen	406	397	308	(98)	41.9%	40.6%	33.4%	-8.4%	59.0%	64.1%	68.2%	8.8%
Taft Park *	12	Gen	438	386	240	(198)	41.3%	34.2%	59.3%	17.8%	54.4%	50.4%	51.5%	-4.9%
Belgian Park	18	Gen	426	440	422	(4)	36.6%	37.0%	29.4%	-7.2%	20.1%	28.1%	25.0%	4.9%
Kelly *	2	Gen	588	571	609	61	35.6%	0.2%	26.3%	-9.3%	42.8%	100.0%	48.9%	6.1%
Hollywood Park	5	Gen	312	325	409	97	33.3%	32.9%	28.1%	-5.2%	49.4%	65.6%	59.6%	10.2%
Peter, Elizabeth	11	Gen	40	44	56	16	30.0%	31.8%	19.6%	-10.4%	36.4%	18.2%	50.0%	13.6%
Crane	9	Gen	519	489	471	(48)	27.7%	25.4%	20.6%	-7.1%	35.0%	27.7%	25.5%	0.5%
Richards Voc	11	Voc	159	195	205	46	27.7%	21.0%	15.6%	-12.1%	41.5%	64.7%	70.0%	29.4%
Wilson	14	Gen	471	571	524	53	18.7%	13.7%	11.3%	-7.4%	6.7%	18.0%	6.8%	-0.1%
Hyde	6	Gen	511	366	344	(167)	12.5%	11.0%	9.0%	-3.0%	32.7%	74.3%	31.3%	8.6%
Tilden	13	Gen	464	446	327	(137)	10.2%	9.3%	7.6%	-3.1%	82.9%	76.5%	73.9%	-9.0%
Lincoln Park	3	Gen	257	251	413	156	9.3%	20.7%	22.3%	12.9%	89.5%	61.1%	20.6%	-69.0%
Dunbar	6	Gen	923	1,017	816	(107)	7.8%	9.1%	6.7%	-1.0%	66.7%	68.4%	60.4%	-6.3%
Williams -	8	Gen	323	323	309	36	4.0%	5.6%	5.0%	0.9%	60.0%	72.7%	56.3%	-3.7%
Lane	8	Gen	427	400	334	(93)	4.0%	2.5%	3.0%	-1.0%	75.0%	57.1%	63.2%	-11.8%
Orr	5	Gen	493	448	408	(85)	3.4%	2.2%	0.7%	-2.7%	84.6%	77.8%	100.0%	15.4%
Lane	19	Gen	674	584	501	(173)	1.8%	1.7%	1.0%	-0.8%	72.7%	50.0%	50.0%	-22.7%
Douglas Voc	9	Voc	174	136	150	(24)	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	-1.1%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR
Marshall	10	Gen	487	427	327	(160)	1.0%	0.9%	2.4%	1.4%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%
King, MLK	14	Gen	411	493	351	(60)	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.7%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR
Hanson	16	Gen	584	565	402	(182)	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	-0.1%	NDR	0.0%	NDR	NDR
Multicultural Voc	7	Voc	412	386	309	(103)	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR
Curtis/Voc	15	Voc	378	721	568	(10)	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	100.0%	25.0%	25.0%
Harlan	19	Gen	645	429	405	(240)	0.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%	NDR	50.0%	50.0%
Phillips	11	Gen	710	558	470	(240)	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	100.0%	NDR	100.0%	0.0%
Austin *	7	Gen	776	479	139	(637)	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	-0.1%	100.0%	100.0%	NDR	NDR
Carver	30	Gen	352	427	438	(114)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	100.0%	NDR
Calumet	16	Gen	537	527	338	(329)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	0.0%	NDR
Butler	15	Gen	399	393	310	(89)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR	NDR
Delano	3	Gen	481	311	341	(140)	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	100.0%	NDR	NDR
Fenger	30	Gen	504	519	463	(41)	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	66.7%	NDR	NDR
Curtis	30	Gen	546	638	583	37	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	NDR	0.0%	0.0%	NDR
Crane	9	Gen	474	474	375	(118)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR	NDR
Hubbard	8	Gen	392	373	461	69	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR	NDR
Marshall	9	Gen	456	428	462	6	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR	NDR
Roe Park	14	Gen	653	554	561	(92)	0.0%	0.2%	0.7%	0.7%	NDR	100.0%	0.0%	NDR
Lincoln Voc	16	Voc	462	525	552	90	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	NDR	NDR	0.0%	NDR
Lincoln Voc	11	Voc	547	568	523	(24)	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	NDR	NDR	0.0%	NDR
Flower Voc	7	Vo	166	185	207	41	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR	NDR
Austin	18	Gen	527	589	598	71	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	NDR	NDR	0.0%	NDR
Tuley Voc.	11	Voc	936	926	977	41	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.4%	NDR	0.0%	0.0%	NDR
South Shore	17	Gen	663	562	442	(221)	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	NDR	100.0%	100.0%	NDR
Bowen	17	Gen	318	260	323	5	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	NDR	NDR	0.0%	NDR
Lakeview	13	Gen	558	551	564	6	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR	NDR
West Vo. Career Mgn	3	Vo	73	247	3	(70)	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	50.0%	NDR	NDR
Englewood	16	Gen	471	264	337	(134)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR	NDR
CITYWIDE TOTALS			29,311	29,075	26,130	(3,181)	22.4%	22.2%	21.7%	-0.7%	33.2%	33.1%	32.6%	-0.5%
SCHOOL DO-THERE WHITE			4,002	3,844	1,734	(2,268)	90.7%	90.4%	79.5%	-1.2%	30.1%	27.3%	23.6%	-7.1%
SCHOOL DO-THERE WHITE			5,427	5,084	6,108	681	50.9%	51.1%	56.1%	5.3%	32.7%	34.7%	34.1%	1.4%
SCHOOLS LESS THAN A THIRD WHIT			9,978	12,827	13,665	3,687	5.2%	5.3%	6.4%	0.8%	48.0%	53.5%	43.6%	-4.4%
SCHOOLS WITH NO WHITES			9,906	7,133	4,473	(5,392)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	NDR	NDR	NDR
					PERCENT WH	2/3	46.3%	47.1%	28.2%	-28.6%				
					ATTENDING	1/3	41.7%	40.9%	50.3%	18.5%				
					EACH LEVEL LESS	1/3	3.8%	10.3%	15.4%	6.6%				
						NONE	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				

SKIP AT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

DROPOUT RATES - Schools Ranked by Percent Black Entering Class

TABLE 3A

School Level: Mid

TREND COMPARISONS - BLACK

SCHOOL NAME	DIST	TYPE	1982 ENTERING FRESHMEN	1983 ENTERING FRESHMEN	1984 ENTERING FRESHMEN	CHANGE ENTERING FRESHMEN	1982 PERCENT BLACK ENROLLED	1983 PERCENT BLACK ENROLLED	1984 PERCENT BLACK ENROLLED	CHANGE PERCENT BLACK ENROLLED	1982 PERCENT BLACK DROPOUT	1983 PERCENT BLACK DROPOUT	1984 PERCENT BLACK DROPOUT	CHANGE PERCENT BLACK DROPOUT
[illegible]	20	Gen	552	427	438	(114)	100.0%	99.5%	99.5%	-0.5%	50.0%	55.6%	49.0%	-1.0%
[illegible]	3	Gen	392	373	461	69	100.0%	99.7%	99.8%	-0.2%	48.5%	52.1%	52.9%	4.4%
Hyde Park	14	Gen	653	554	561	(92)	100.0%	99.5%	99.3%	-0.7%	36.8%	35.3%	36.3%	-0.6%
Tilden Voc	7	Voc	166	185	207	41	100.0%	98.9%	100.0%	0.0%	43.7%	43.4%	40.6%	-3.1%
[illegible]	3	Gen	494	474	376	(118)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	97.3%	95.6%	58.5%	-4.7%
Wm To. Dunne Hsp.	3	Voc	73	347	3	(70)	100.0%	98.7%	33.3%	-66.7%	62.5%	60.1%	100.0%	37.5%
Lindblom Voc	16	Voc	462	525	552	90	100.0%	99.8%	99.6%	-0.2%	33.3%	32.4%	31.1%	-2.1%
[illegible]	16	Gen	667	527	338	(329)	100.0%	100.0%	99.7%	-0.3%	54.2%	55.8%	52.8%	-1.4%
Tilden	17	Gen	318	350	323	5	100.0%	99.6%	99.7%	-0.3%	45.3%	47.1%	55.3%	10.0%
Austin	13	Gen	558	551	564	6	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	59.6%	67.5%	62.5%	3.0%
Dunbar Voc	11	Voc	547	568	523	(24)	99.8%	99.6%	99.6%	-0.3%	35.7%	37.0%	33.3%	-2.3%
Curtis	20	Gen	546	638	583	37	99.8%	99.7%	99.7%	-0.2%	31.4%	32.2%	36.8%	5.4%
Marshall	18	Gen	527	589	568	71	99.8%	100.0%	99.8%	.0%	30.6%	34.1%	35.3%	4.6%
Farragut	8	Gen	481	311	341	(140)	99.8%	99.7%	100.0%	0.0%	56.6%	51.7%	62.2%	5.7%
Englewood	16	Gen	471	354	337	(134)	99.8%	100.0%	99.7%	-0.1%	57.3%	59.2%	45.3%	-11.4%
Marshall	7	Gen	456	424	462	6	99.8%	100.0%	100.0%	0.2%	60.1%	51.2%	53.6%	-6.5%
Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	412	386	309	(103)	99.8%	97.4%	98.1%	-1.7%	30.4%	21.4%	35.8%	5.4%
Carver	15	Gen	399	393	210	(89)	99.7%	99.7%	100.0%	.3%	54.6%	59.2%	49.8%	-4.7%
Calumet	17	Gen	683	562	462	(221)	99.7%	99.5%	99.5%	-0.4%	53.9%	49.8%	56.2%	2.2%
Harlan	19	Gen	685	429	405	(280)	99.7%	99.8%	99.3%	-0.4%	45.0%	40.2%	34.6%	-10.4%
Kenwood	16	Gen	584	565	462	(122)	99.7%	99.8%	99.6%	0.1%	59.3%	60.2%	56.7%	-2.6%
Bowen *	7	Gen	776	679	139	(637)	99.6%	99.4%	98.6%	-1.1%	62.4%	61.3%	54.3%	-7.7%
[illegible]	11	Gen	710	558	470	(240)	99.6%	99.6%	99.6%	0.1%	58.0%	60.3%	61.5%	3.5%
Lindblom Voc.	11	Voc	136	126	177	41	99.6%	99.6%	98.9%	-0.7%	26.7%	23.6%	26.0%	-0.7%
Lincoln	14	Gen	411	403	351	(60)	99.3%	100.0%	100.0%	0.7%	52.0%	55.2%	45.7%	-6.3%
Vaught	15	Gen	504	510	463	(41)	99.2%	98.7%	99.3%	0.0%	58.3%	49.5%	42.2%	-16.0%
Englewood Voc	9	Voc	174	136	150	(24)	98.8%	99.3%	99.3%	0.5%	60.0%	57.1%	71.2%	11.2%
Lindblom	10	Gen	678	721	568	(10)	95.7%	97.8%	98.4%	2.7%	21.7%	18.5%	14.0%	-7.7%
[illegible]	14	Gen	471	571	524	53	76.6%	83.0%	86.1%	9.4%	21.2%	24.8%	23.0%	1.1%
Harrison	10	Gen	487	417	327	(160)	75.4%	79.4%	81.3%	5.0%	53.2%	55.7%	58.4%	5.2%
[illegible]	13	Gen	464	446	327	(137)	74.1%	75.8%	69.1%	-5.0%	49.4%	54.6%	49.7%	0.4%
[illegible]	5	Gen	493	448	428	(65)	69.0%	68.2%	76.3%	7.3%	46.1%	54.3%	55.0%	8.9%
Lawndale Com	3	Gen	257	261	413	156	65.8%	66.4%	59.1%	-6.7%	42.8%	44.7%	48.3%	5.5%
Crane Tech	18	Gen	426	440	422	(4)	62.4%	62.2%	69.7%	7.3%	27.2%	28.2%	30.0%	2.8%
Kelly	19	Gen	674	584	501	(173)	59.6%	47.1%	47.3%	-12.3%	53.1%	45.3%	49.8%	-3.3%
Tech, Prep	11	Gen	40	44	56	16	57.5%	54.5%	78.6%	21.1%	33.3%	37.5%	35.0%	4.5%
Tuley	3	Gen	519	489	471	(48)	53.8%	53.4%	60.5%	7.2%	13.7%	13.7%	8.2%	-5.5%
Wells Prep *	12	Gen	438	386	240	(198)	50.0%	52.4%	27.1%	-22.9%	46.6%	42.5%	46.0%	-0.6%
Burnham *	8	Gen	283	323	309	26	37.1%	38.0%	21.0%	-16.1%	40.2%	46.4%	45.9%	5.7%
Austin	2	Gen	291	236	270	(21)	30.9%	29.2%	34.5%	3.6%	43.7%	44.6%	48.8%	5.1%
Wells	6	Gen	511	365	344	(167)	5.0%	16.4%	21.2%	-4.6%	47.6%	52.7%	61.4%	13.8%
Lawndale Voc	11	Voc	159	156	205	46	15.2%	19.2%	46.8%	21.7%	36.2%	39.3%	37.8%	11.6%
Marshall	12	Gen	662	716	719	57	14.8%	22.6%	23.6%	-1.1%	33.6%	29.5%	29.6%	-4.0%
Dr. Sumner	1	Gen	317	317	205	(112)	12.4%	12.0%	4.8%	-17.5%	31.3%	54.5%	40.0%	8.8%
Tilden Voc	4	Voc	373	358	323	(50)	12.3%	27.7%	20.3%	7.8%	14.5%	15.6%	17.2%	2.8%
Kennedy	12	Gen	329	382	374	45	11.5%	19.6%	28.5%	7.0%	44.6%	43.3%	51.8%	7.3%
Hirs *	7	Gen	548	571	609	61	9.5%	18.7%	30.3%	0.5%	52.8%	49.8%	45.5%	-7.3%
Douglass	4	Gen	485	516	520	35	5.5%	16.1%	25.0%	9.5%	36.1%	23.8%	30.0%	-6.1%
Hirs	3	Gen	525	1,162	1,065	340	0.8%	13.2%	9.8%	-1.1%	19.5%	19.1%	18.8%	-0.7%
Crane	9	Gen	923	1,017	816	(107)	0.5%	8.4%	10.5%	.5%	53.5%	64.4%	55.8%	1.7%
Marshall	1	Gen	406	397	308	(98)	0.1%	11.1%	9.8%	-1.5%	64.2%	73.8%	77.8%	13.5%
Taylor	2	Gen	350	358	289	(71)	9.7%	9.5%	9.5%	-0.4%	37.5%	45.2%	34.8%	-2.7%
Roosevelt	1	Gen	392	378	407	15	6.4%	7.7%	9.1%	2.7%	56.8%	53.5%	60.8%	4.0%
Tuley	1	Gen	489	501	444	(45)	5.1%	7.0%	11.8%	5.0%	38.6%	43.5%	31.5%	-2.7%
Gladstone	2	Gen	356	376	349	(7)	4.8%	4.3%	6.3%	1.0%	61.3%	53.5%	43.8%	-17.0%
Crane	4	Gen	829	794	736	(93)	3.4%	10.6%	14.5%	11.4%	54.2%	50.8%	46.3%	-7.9%
Roberts	15	Gen	319	357	312	(7)	2.2%	5.3%	22.1%	19.8%	13.5%	52.8%	54.2%	30.7%
Lane Tech	8	Gen	427	400	334	(93)	1.6%	2.3%	0.1%	-0.7%	15.7%	44.4%	50.0%	23.3%
Herzl	4	Gen	288	302	280	(8)	1.3%	4.0%	18.2%	17.2%	0.0%	35.4%	34.7%	34.7%
Kelvyn Park	9	Gen	312	325	409	97	1.0%	0.6%	1.5%	0.5%	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	-20.0%
Washington	20	Gen	338	443	341	3	0.3%	2.3%	4.7%	4.4%	0.0%	14.3%	25.7%	25.7%
Hyde	15	Gen	291	313	335	44	0.0%	0.6%	1.4%	1.4%	DSB	0.0%	16.7%	DSB
Hirs *	6	Gen	355	306	325	(30)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	DSB	DSB	DSB	DSB
[illegible]			29,311	29,085	26,130	(3,181)	62.1%	61.7%	60.3%	-1.8%	45.4%	44.3%	43.5%	-1.9%
[illegible]			14,195	13,277	11,650	(2,545)	49.6%	49.3%	39.3%	-0.1%	45.0%	45.3%	42.7%	-4.1%
[illegible]			4,459	3,769	2,948	(1,321)	65.3%	68.3%	72.0%	7.1%	40.2%	41.4%	35.7%	-1.4%
[illegible]			6,112	6,816	7,005	893	19.1%	21.3%	23.3%	4.1%	38.8%	38.7%	42.5%	3.8%
[illegible]			4,756	5,066	4,367	(389)	3.3%	5.1%	5.0%	2.3%	42.3%	50.3%	37.7%	-5.0%

PERCENT	45%	35.3%	73.3%	73.3%	-3.3%
BLACK	50%	15.1%	14.3%	13.3%	-4.6%
OR EACH	10%	6.4%	8.3%	10.3%	4.3%
DROPOUT	Under 10%	3.3%	1.4%	1.3%	0.7%

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — DROPOUT RATES — Schools Ranked by Percent Hispanic Entering Class — TABLE 35

School Level Data

SCHOOL NAME	GRADE	TYPE	1982 ENTERING FRESHMEN	1983 ENTERING FRESHMEN	1984 ENTERING FRESHMEN	CHANGE ENTERING FRESHMEN	1982 PERCENT HISPANIC ENROLLED	1983 PERCENT HISPANIC ENROLLED	1984 PERCENT HISPANIC ENROLLED	CHANGE PERCENT HISPANIC ENROLLED	1982 PERCENT HISPANIC DROPOUT	1983 PERCENT HISPANIC DROPOUT	1984 PERCENT HISPANIC DROPOUT	CHANGE PERCENT HISPANIC DROPOUT
Juarez	9	Gen	427	400	334	(93)	93.4%	95.3%	94.8%	1.5%	51.8%	40.7%	47.2%	-4.6%
Cervantes	6	Gen	923	1,017	816	(107)	81.0%	81.8%	79.4%	-1.6%	55.4%	58.6%	50.1%	-5.3%
Kelvyn Park	9	Gen	312	325	409	97	63.3%	63.7%	68.8%	5.5%	41.3%	47.1%	44.7%	3.4%
Wells	6	Gen	511	365	344	(167)	61.3%	71.2%	69.2%	7.9%	53.7%	54.8%	56.5%	2.8%
Harrison -	6	Gen	283	323	309	26	57.6%	69.3%	73.1%	15.5%	50.4%	54.3%	53.3%	2.8%
Roberto Voc	12	Voc	159	195	205	46	47.2%	47.2%	37.6%	-9.6%	29.4%	34.8%	27.3%	-1.9%
Lakeview	3	Gen	406	397	308	(98)	41.1%	43.6%	53.7%	12.8%	44.1%	58.7%	46.6%	2.5%
Lane	19	Gen	674	504	501	(173)	38.6%	50.7%	51.3%	12.7%	39.3%	36.3%	39.2%	-0.1%
Lincoln	4	Gen	329	704	736	(93)	29.2%	32.6%	34.3%	5.6%	53.3%	46.6%	45.7%	-8.2%
Kelly	3	Gen	355	296	325	(30)	26.3%	21.3%	28.3%	+1.3%	39.5%	46.2%	41.4%	2.0%
Orr	5	Gen	493	448	408	(85)	26.6%	29.0%	22.8%	-3.8%	55.6%	56.7%	56.6%	1.0%
Lincoln Park	3	Gen	257	351	413	156	23.3%	20.3%	13.8%	-9.5%	57.4%	41.5%	46.3%	-10.9%
Farragut	10	Gen	487	437	327	(160)	22.4%	19.5%	15.0%	-7.4%	60.4%	69.3%	66.0%	5.6%
Lane	2	Gen	548	571	609	61	21.3%	0.4%	24.3%	2.3%	38.5%	0.0%	40.8%	2.3%
Prosser Voc	4	Voc	373	358	323	(50)	21.2%	22.3%	19.8%	-1.4%	18.6%	19.4%	14.8%	-3.8%
Von Steuben	1	Gen	317	217	205	(112)	17.0%	20.3%	26.8%	9.8%	27.8%	36.8%	40.0%	12.2%
Clinton	13	Gen	464	446	327	(137)	15.1%	14.3%	23.2%	8.2%	60.7%	47.2%	35.8%	-24.9%
Curie	12	Gen	662	716	719	57	15.0%	20.6%	27.1%	12.2%	42.2%	22.3%	26.2%	-16.0%
Roosevelt	1	Gen	392	378	407	15	14.8%	18.5%	21.6%	6.8%	54.3%	45.2%	37.3%	-17.0%
Lincoln	2	Gen	291	236	270	(21)	13.4%	17.8%	14.8%	1.4%	30.8%	22.6%	39.4%	8.6%
Washington	30	Gen	338	443	341	3	13.3%	14.2%	21.7%	8.4%	22.7%	35.3%	29.7%	7.0%
Young	9	Gen	519	439	471	(48)	12.5%	15.7%	12.5%	0.2%	23.7%	21.7%	23.5%	-0.2%
Herman	4	Gen	388	302	380	(8)	12.2%	12.6%	13.6%	1.4%	44.4%	37.3%	34.4%	-10.1%
Lane	3	Tech	825	1,162	1,065	240	10.7%	12.1%	11.5%	0.8%	22.5%	19.5%	13.2%	-9.3%
Mann, Horace	11	Gen	40	44	56	16	10.0%	9.1%	1.8%	-8.2%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	-25.0%
Leonard	15	Gen	319	357	312	(7)	9.7%	7.3%	11.3%	2.1%	53.2%	43.5%	53.6%	-0.3%
Gladstone	2	Gen	356	374	349	(7)	9.3%	16.8%	16.6%	7.3%	32.0%	49.1%	43.2%	11.3%
Agassiz	12	Gen	418	386	240	(198)	8.0%	12.4%	12.1%	4.1%	39.4%	41.0%	25.0%	-9.4%
Jamieson	4	Gen	485	516	520	35	4.3%	6.6%	7.3%	3.0%	33.3%	32.3%	17.1%	-16.2%
Keith	15	Gen	391	313	335	44	3.1%	2.6%	5.7%	2.6%	11.1%	14.3%	47.1%	35.1%
Palmer	2	Gen	360	358	289	(71)	2.8%	5.3%	5.9%	3.1%	12.5%	27.3%	21.4%	8.9%
Kennedy	12	Gen	329	382	374	45	2.1%	4.3%	4.5%	2.4%	28.6%	54.3%	56.3%	27.7%
Kinzie	14	Gen	471	571	524	53	1.7%	0.7%	1.1%	-0.6%	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Dett	1	Gen	489	501	444	(45)	1.4%	1.0%	1.6%	0.1%	28.6%	0.0%	33.3%	4.8%
Pasteur	20	Gen	504	519	463	(41)	0.8%	0.8%	0.3%	-0.6%	100.0%	66.7%	0.0%	-100.0%
Thorp, Edwin	18	Gen	426	440	422	(4)	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	.0%	66.7%	ERR	33.3%	-33.3%
Chicago Voc.	11	Voc	136	326	377	41	0.4%	0.3%	0.6%	0.2%	50.0%	33.3%	75.0%	25.0%
Lindblom	15	Tech	578	721	568	(10)	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	+0.2%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-100.0%
Phillips	11	Gen	710	558	470	(240)	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	-0.3%	50.0%	100.0%	ERR	ERR
Austin	7	Gen	776	679	139	(637)	0.3%	0.2%	1.4%	1.2%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%
Harper	15	Gen	399	393	310	(89)	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	-0.3%	100.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR
Englewood	16	Gen	471	364	337	(134)	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	100.0%	ERR	100.0%	0.0%
Hanley	8	Gen	481	311	341	(140)	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Sullivan	18	Gen	527	589	598	71	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR
Julian Voc	11	Voc	547	568	523	(24)	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	ERR
Bunche	19	Gen	545	429	405	(140)	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-100.0%
Austin Shore	17	Gen	563	562	442	(221)	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Calhoun	16	Gen	667	527	338	(329)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Kosciusko	13	Gen	558	551	564	6	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Crane	9	Gen	494	479	376	(118)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Lawson Voc	16	Voc	462	525	552	90	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	0.0%	ERR	ERR
Farnum	20	Gen	552	427	438	(114)	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	50.0%	ERR	ERR
Hibbard	16	Gen	584	565	402	(182)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Simeon Voc	9	Voc	174	136	150	(24)	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	ERR	100.0%	100.0%	ERR
Westinghouse Voc	7	Voc	412	386	309	(103)	0.0%	0.3%	1.9%	1.9%	ERR	25.0%	20.0%	ERR
Flower Voc	7	Voc	166	185	207	41	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	100.0%	ERR	ERR
Marshall	1	Gen	456	424	462	6	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Tuley Park	14	Gen	653	554	561	(92)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	0.0%	ERR	ERR
Wilson	8	Gen	392	373	461	69	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Burke	17	Gen	318	350	323	5	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	100.0%	ERR	ERR
Curtis	14	Gen	411	493	351	(60)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
Adlai E. Stevenson High	1	Voc	73	347	3	(70)	0.0%	5.7%	33.3%	33.3%	ERR	54.3%	100.0%	ERR
Parkside	20	Gen	546	498	529	17	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ERR	ERR	ERR	ERR
DISTRICT TOTALS			39,511	39,075	36,130	(3,381)	13.4%	14.2%	15.2%	1.8%	47.0%	45.7%	42.6%	-4.4%
SCHOOLS OVER 50% HISPANIC			2,456	3,018	3,431	(244)	74.1%	77.0%	66.7%	-7.5%	52.4%	50.4%	46.8%	-5.5%
SCHOOLS 5% - 49% HISPANIC			2,916	1,838	1,868	(433)	33.5%	35.7%	31.3%	-2.0%	45.2%	48.9%	36.3%	-4.9%
SCHOOLS 1% - 4% HISPANIC			5,314	3,596	7,611	(200)	14.5%	13.5%	15.6%	0.3%	39.4%	35.3%	35.6%	-3.4%
SCHOOLS LESS 1% HISPANIC			17,006	15,444	13,414	(2,485)	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	+0.1%	32.9%	34.5%	47.9%	15.0%

PERCENT	50%	46.1%	53.2% 57.4%
HISPANIC	25%	28.6%	15.5% 14.6%
IN EACH	5%	25.3%	28.6% 39.3%
DROPOUT Index	5%	2.2%	1.8% 1.4%

V. ASSESSING THE FINANCIAL IMPACT OF DROPOUTS

In the past year, much has been written about the "Dropout Problem" in Chicago. Parents have protested. A coffin has been carried through the streets of the city in a torchlight parade. The personal tragedies associated with being a Dropout have been highlighted: involvement in gangs; crime; inability to get steady, meaningful employment; epidemic adolescent pregnancies; and the cycle of welfare. For the most part, these efforts have focused on the reduced quality of the individual lives of Dropouts. The Panel shares in the anguish of concerned parents and community activists who have helped to focus attention on these personal tragedies.

But there is also a policy dimension to such questions. Unfortunately, personal concern often does not seriously effect policy decisions. These decisions more often turn on issues of finance. Too often, such policy decisions are made in such a narrow framework that they end up costing the taxpayer more, rather than less, but the costs are attributed to some other governmental body, in this case, the courts, the welfare system, and the state treasury. In the process, the taxpayer is bilked, and the victims of this short-sighted policy are neglected.

In order to estimate the true costs associated with the Dropout Problem, the Panel has assessed the costs to the Chicago Board of Education of seriously attempting to increase the Graduation Rate, to reduce the number of students who drop out. There are two costs involved here. The Board has recently adopted a Dropout Prevention plan and estimated its costs at $18.8 million. A second, less obvious cost is the added expense of educating those students if they remained in school. The Panel has estimated those costs, if every Dropout of the Class of 1982 had been retained until graduation, at $17.4 million. Thus, together, the Board's total potential annual costs of Dropout Prevention would be $36.2 million. However, because those additional students would also generate revenues, the net cost to retain students would only be $3.5 million to the Board, making total additional costs to the Board of $22.3 million.

But there are also costs to society, often neglected, which are generated as a result of large numbers of individuals dropping out of school. The primary work in this area has been done by Henry M. Levin, in a report to the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, "The Costs to the Nation of Inadequate Education," (1972). The Panel's estimates of social costs are based on his calculations, updated, as applied to the Class of 1982. The Panel's estimate is that aggregate lifetime costs to society (in 1982 dollars) of the 12,804 Dropouts from the Class of 1982 are $451 million in lost taxes, welfare costs, and the losses and costs of crime. Thus, neglect of the Dropout

Problem is estimated to cost the taxpayer $12.49 for every $1 of additional resources needed to address the problem. One dollar, spent now to reduce the number of Dropouts, stands to save the taxpayer $12 in other costs in the future. A 12 for 1 return on investment would seem hard to turn down.

A. The Costs of Dropout Reduction

The Chicago Board of Education has adopted a Dropout Reduction plan which it has estimated to cost $18.8 million. It has included that figure in its legislative agenda, and will be lobbying the Illinois General Assembly for funds to support this program. It is advocated as one piece of the educational reform agenda which will be widely debated this spring. There are several other Dropout reduction proposals in the reform agenda advocated by other proponents. In another study, to be released in May, the Panel has analyzed these reform proposals and estimated Dropout Reduction costs to run between $21.6 million and $31.5 million, statewide, depending upon how they are shaped and implemented. Chicago costs for these programs would be between $13.2 million and $18.7 million, exclusive of summer school costs. The Panel has taken no position on the likelihood of success of any of these programs.

The centerpiece of the Chicago Board's plan is the reinstitution of free summer school for those students most in need of extra help. Currently, students who fall behind or fail can only make up their work by adding another year to their school career. This is a powerful inducement to drop out, as the statistics on overage entrants clearly indicate; three of five overage entrants in the Class of 1982 became Dropouts! Compared with an additional year of school, summer school is a very cheap alternative, as the following data show. For the sake of these estimates, the Board's projected costs of Dropout Reduction will be accepted as $18.8 million.

Students do not drop out all at one time. Students who drop out as freshmen would have required three additional years of school to stay until graduation. On the other hand, those few students who drop out during their fourth year, would have cost the Board nothing more to educate, since their teachers and books were already in place. Further, there is some flexibility in the capacity of the school system to teach more children at no additional cost, as empty school desks are filled in already functioning classes. But that flexibility is moderate in scope. To estimate the additional costs of retaining Dropouts, the Panel ascribed actual additional costs which would have been incurred at each school from which the students dropped out. Incremental costs were assessed only as aggregates of students occurred which would require the formation of a new class unit. In addition, continued student enrollment and attendance would generate increased revenues in state aid and categorical aid or reimbursements. Thus, the net cost to the Chicago Board of Education, $3.5 million, is less that the total cost to the taxpayer; those total costs

would be $17.4 million. Even calculating the total taxpayer costs with the prevention effort costs, the full cost of retention for the Class of 1982 would be $36.2 million.

These costs relate primarily to additional staff required to teach the retained Dropouts. The Panel calculated costs if 25% of the Dropouts stayed in school, if 50% did, and if 100% did. As we calculated the effect at each school, these various percentages of success created different costs, for the incremental thresholds are not crossed as frequently for lower degrees of success. The 12,804 Dropouts of the Class of 1982 primarily left school in their second, third, and fourth years:

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year
Dropouts	899	3,533	3,899	4,473

At 100% success in retaining student Dropouts until graduation, the following additional teachers would be required in the following year:

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year
Teachers		8	148	305

Thus, 461 additional teacher annual salaries would have been required, if all Dropouts in the Class of 1982 had remained in school until their class graduated. The total cost of additional staff would have been $14,580,047 (see Table 36). Additional costs for books, supplies, educational equipment, transportation, and food would have been approximately $2,858,500. Total additional cost to the taxpayer would have been $17,438,547. However, that would not have been the net cost to the Chicago Board of Education. Because it receives revenues from the federal and state governments on the basis of students served or faculty employed and from some local taxes which are responsive to added costs, the Board would have received an additional $13.9 million in revenue; $9.9 million from the state, $2.2 million from the federal government, and $1.8 million in local taxes. The taxpayer, of course, would have paid for all of those revenues in federal, state, or local taxes. However, the net cost to the Board of Education would have been only $3,514,618 if all 12,804 Dropouts had remained until graduation. At lower success rates, 50% retention or 25% retention, costs would have been dramatically lower (see Tables 37 and 38). For 25% success in lowering the Dropout Rate, the Board would actually have netted increased revenues of $511,748! These estimates are built on staff needs of:

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year
50% retained		0	56	135
25% retained		0	14	51

TABLE 36

ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL COSTS IF ALL DROPOUTS REMAIN IN SCHOOL - CLASS OF 1982

SECOND YEAR		THIRD YEAR		FOURTH YEAR		TOTAL - ALL DROPOUTS REMAIN IN SCHOOL	
COST		COST		COST		COST	
Staff	$253,016	Staff	$4,680,796	Staff	$9,646,235	Staff	$14,580,047
Books	16,362	Books	80,662	Books	151,624	Books	248,648
Suplies	7,597	Suplies	37,450	Suplies	70,397	Suplies	115,444
Ed'l Eqpt	13,602	Ed'l Eqpt	67,056	Ed'l Eqpt	126,048	Ed'l Eqpt	206,706
Transportation	6,158	Transportation	30,359	Transportation	57,067	Transportation	93,585
Food	144,379	Food	711,779	Food	1,337,959	Food	$2,194,117
TOTAL	$441,114	TOTAL	$5,608,103	TOTAL	$11,389,330	TOTAL	$17,438,547
REVENUE		REVENUE		REVENUE		REVENUE	
State Aid	$645,653	State Aid	$3,183,018	State Aid	$5,983,241	State Aid	$9,811,912
Food	144,379	Food	$711,779	Food	1,337,959	Food	2,194,117
Transportation	6,158	Transportation	$30,359	Transportation	57,067	Transportation	93,585
Pension	31,658	Pension	585,680	Pension	1,206,977	Pension	1,824,315
TOTAL	$827,849	TOTAL	$4,510,837	TOTAL	$8,585,243	TOTAL	$13,923,929
NET COST	($386,735)		$1,097,266	NET	$2,804,087	NET COST	$3,514,618

FIRST YEAR DROPOUTS	SECOND YEAR TEACHER REQUIREMENT	SECOND YEAR DROPOUTS	THIRD YEAR TEACHER REQUIREMENT	THIRD YEAR DROPOUTS	FOURTH YEAR TEACHER REQUIREMENT	TOTAL ADDITIONAL TEACHER YEARS
899	8	3,533	148	3,899	305	461

TABLE 37

ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL COSTS IF 50% OF DROPOUTS REMAIN IN SCHOOL - CLASS OF 1982

SECOND YEAR		THIRD YEAR		FOURTH YEAR		TOTAL - 50% OF DROPOUTS REMAIN IN SCHOOL	
COST		COST		COST		COST	
Staff	$0	Staff	$1,771,112	Staff	$4,269,645	Staff	$6,040,757
Books	8,181	Books	40,331	Books	75,812	Books	124,324
Suplies	3,738	Suplies	18,725	Suplies	35,198	Suplies	57,722
Ed'l Eqpt	6,804	Ed'l Eqpt	33,528	Ed'l Eqpt	63,024	Ed'l Eqpt	103,353
Transportation	3,079	Transportation	15,180	Transportation	28,534	Transportation	46,792
Food	72,190	Food	355,890	Food	668,979	Food	1,097,059
TOTAL	$94,049	TOTAL	$2,234,766	TOTAL	$4,141,193	TOTAL	$7,470,007
REVENUE		REVENUE		REVENUE		REVENUE	
State Aid	322,826	State Aid	1,591,509	State Aid	2,991,620	State Aid	$4,905,956
Food	72,190	Food	355,890	Food	668,979	Food	1,097,059
Transportation	3,079	Transportation	15,180	Transportation	28,534	Transportation	46,792
Pension	0	Pension	221,609	Pension	534,236	Pension	755,844
TOTAL	$398,095	TOTAL	$2,184,187	TOTAL	$4,223,369	TOTAL	$6,805,651
NET COST	($304,046)	NET	$50,579	NET COST	$917,824	NET	$664,356

FIRST YEAR DROPOUTS	SECOND YEAR TEACHER REQUIREMENT	SECOND YEAR DROPOUTS	THIRD YEAR TEACHER REQUIREMENT	THIRD YEAR DROPOUTS	FOURTH YEAR TEACHER REQUIREMENT	TOTAL ADDITIONAL TEACHER YEARS
450	0	1,777	56	1,950	135	191

TABLE 38

ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL COSTS IF 25% DROPOUTS REMAIN IN SCHOOL - CLASS OF 1982

SECOND YEAR		THIRD YEAR		FOURTH YEAR		TOTAL - 25% OF DROPOUTS REMAIN IN SCHOOL	
COST		COST		COST		COST	
Staff	$0	Staff	$442,778	Staff	$1,612,977	Staff	$2,055,755
Books	4,090	Books	20,166	Books	37,906	Books	62,162
Suplies	1,899	Suplies	9,363	Suplies	17,599	Suplies	28,861
Ed'l Eqpt	3,400	Ed'l Eqpt	16,764	Ed'l Eqpt	31,512	Ed'l Eqpt	51,677
Transportation	1,540	Transportation	7,590	Transportation	14,267	Transportation	23,396
Food	36,095	Food	177,945	Food	334,490	Food	548,529
TOTAL	$47,024	TOTAL	$674,605	TOTAL	$2,048,751	TOTAL	$2,770,380
REVENUE		REVENUE		REVENUE		REVENUE	
State Aid	161,413	State Aid	795,755	State Aid	1,495,810	State Aid	$2,452,978
Food	36,095	Food	177,945	Food	334,490	Food	548,529
Transportation	1,540	Transportation	7,590	Transportation	14,267	Transportation	23,396
Pension	0	Pension	55,402	Pension	201,822	Pension	257,225
TOTAL	$199,048	TOTAL	$1,036,691	TOTAL	$2,046,389	TOTAL	$3,282,128
NET COST	($152,023)	NET COST	($362,086)	NET COST	$2,362		($511,748)

FIRST YEAR DROPOUTS	SECOND YEAR TEACHER REQUIREMENT	SECOND YEAR DROPOUTS	THIRD YEAR TEACHER REQUIREMENT	THIRD YEAR DROPOUTS	FOURTH YEAR TEACHER REQUIREMENT	TOTAL ADDITIONAL TEACHER YEARS
225	0	883	14	975	51	65

B. The Social Costs of Dropouts

The flip side of the additional costs to prevent and educate Dropouts is the social costs encountered when individuals do not graduate from high school. It must be noted that not all Dropouts generate social costs. Some individuals are quite successful without a high school degree. This is less true for today's high school students than it was for many who are now adults. Still, there are many enterprises, even in our current economy, for which a high school degree is not necessary: everything from athletes to sales positions, from auto mechanics to manual labor. But, in the aggregate, Dropouts do much more poorly in today's economy than do high school Graduates. The following data are calculated on the differential effects of high school Graduates and Non-graduates(Dropouts).

In . .'uals who receive .nsufficient education in our society suffer in comparison to those who have received at least a high school diploma. The individual's lifetime earnings will be substantially lower, and his vocational choices will be severely limited. Inadequate education not only adversely affects the individual, the effect is felt by society in at least three ways:

--Foregone (i.e., reduced) lifetime earnings, and thereby, foregone taxes paid;
--Increased costs of income maintenance and welfare programs;
--Increased costs of crime.

1. Lost Income and Tax Revenue

Levin declared there are three reasons why workers with more education are likely to be more productive and are likely to earn more than those with lower educational attainments:

1. Additional schooling provides a person with greater skills (numerical and language proficiency, conceptual skills, etc.);
2. Additional schooling inculcates "work attitudes;"
3. The more schooling, the more adaptable to change a person is likely to be and this adaptability is needed for higher level jobs.

Levin neglects the gate-keeping function of a high school diploma, without which prospects never even get to interview for many jobs.

Lifetime earnings of high school Graduates were compared to lifetime earnings of high school Dropouts, ages 20 - 24, and analyzed by sex and race. Male Dropouts earn 19% less than male Graduates; female Dropouts earn 21% less than Graduates. Black and Hispanic males earn about 75% of White males; White females earn 59% of what White males earn, while Black females earn 55% and Hispanic females 50%. The lifetime earnings lost range from $204,167 for a White male Dropout to

TABLE 39

EARNINGS PENALTY OF NOT COMPLETING HIGH SCHOOL
By Race and Sex

SEX	RACE	CLASS OF 1982 DROPOUT NUMBER	% OF WHITE EARNINGS NATIONALLY	LIFETIME EARNINGS H.S.GRAD BY SEX/RACE	LIFETIME EARNINGS H.S.DROPOUT BY SEX/RACE	EARNINGS PENALTY OF DROPPING OUT PER STUDENT	TOTAL COST TO ECONOMY FROM CPS DROPOUTS CLASS OF 1982
MALE							
	WHITE	1,250	1.00	$1,084,375	$880,208	$204,167	$255,208,333
	BLACK	4,995	0.75	813,281	660,156	153,125	764,859,375
	HISP	1,096	0.75	813,281	660,156	153,125	167,825,000
FEMALE							
	WHITE	919	0.59	644,964	508,647	136,317	125,275,687
	BLACK	3,645	0.55	593,367	481,648	111,719	407,217,508
	HISP	711	0.50	541,770	439,765	102,005	72,525,373
						TOTAL	$1,792,911,276

TABLE 40

STATE AND FEDERA TAX REVENUES NOT COLLECTED
DUE TO INSUFFICIENT EDUCATION

RACE	CLASS OF 1982 DROPOUT NUMBER	HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE SALARY PER YEAR	STATE TAXES	FEDERAL TAXES	HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT SALARY PER YEAR	STATE TAXES	FEDERAL TAXES	STATE TAXES LOST OVER LIFETIME BY CPS DROPOUTS CLASS OF 1982	FEDERAL TAXES LOST OVER LIFETIME BY CPS DROPOUTS CLASS OF 1982	TOTAL EARNINGS LOST TO ECONOMY FROM CPS DROPOUTS CLASS OF 1982
MALE										
WHITE	1,250	$24,097	$494	$2,690	$19,560	369	$1,845	$7,031,250	$47,531,250	$255,208,333
BLACK	4,995	$18,073	$329	$1,593	$14,670	235	$1,054	$21,128,850	$121,153,725	764,859,375
HISP	1,096	$18,073	$329	$1,593	$14,670	235	$1,054	$4,636,080	$26,583,480	167,825,000
FEMALE										
WHITE	919	$14,333	$226	$1,005	$11,533	142	$585	$3,473,820	$17,369,100	125,275,687
BLACK	3,645	$13,186	$194	$844	$10,703	126	$501	$11,153,700	$56,260,575	407,217,508
HISP	711	$12,039	$163	$683	$9,773	100	$384	$2,015,685	$9,566,505	72,525,373
							TOTAL	$49,439,385	$278,464,635	$1,792,911,276

$102,005 lost by Hispanic female Dropouts(see chart). These lost lifetime earnings represent a considerable loss to the economy of our city, totaling, over 45 years, $1.8 billion. We have not included the effect of this reduction in the economy into our figures, but have used this data to calculate lost tax revenues.

A loss in personal income by Dropouts is a loss in tax revenues at all levels of government. That means that each individual's tax bill is higher proportionally. Of the $1.8 billion in reduced earnings for the Dropouts of the Class of 1982, $278 million represents a reduction in Federal income taxes. Had these students finished high school, their additional lifetime earnings would have generated another $49 million in state income taxes.

Methodology:

The procedure for calculating lost earnings was adapted from Levin. The data base was taken from census data from "Lifetime Earnings Estimates For Men and Women in the U.S., 1979"(P-60, Number 131). The lifetime earnings have been adjusted for inflation. Since average male and female lifetime earnings were given, calculations were made to adjust for racial differences. Tax figures were calculated by using the 1984 1040A and state tax forms for annualized earnings (total lifetime earnings divided by 45 years) for each race and gender. There was no adjustment for "ability factors" in increased earnings, nor for possible college enrollment of high school graduates.

2. Welfare and Income Maintenance Costs

Dropouts occasion higher welfare and unemployment costs. Many welfare costs are education related. Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), medical assistance, and food stamps bear a direct relationship to inadequate education. Eligibility for each of these programs is based on income and employment, two factors directly related to educational attainment. According to Levin, research has shown that the vast majority of AFDC parents have not completed high school. Their employability is low, and even when employed, their earnings are usually too low to make them independent of outside assistance. Just as AFDC costs are dependent on educational attainment, medical assistance for AFDC recipients and food stamps are also educationally related.

General Assistance also bears a relationship to insufficient education. These programs support low income households and suggest the same type of relationship to inadequate education as are apparent in the AFDC programs.

Unemployment compensation also appears to have a

TABLE 41

ESTIMATED COST OF WELFARE EXPENDITURES FROM INADEQUATE EDUCATION
The Class of 1982

RACE	CLASS OF 1982 DROPOUT NUMBER	COST PER RECEPIENT	ESTIMATED CLASS OF 1982 DROPOUTS COST
MALE (Unemployment for 50% of Class)			
WHITE	1,250		
BLACK	4,995		
HISP	1,096		
	7,341	$5,837	$21,425,293
FEMALE (AFDC for 50% of Class)			
WHITE	919		
BLACK	3,645		
HISP	711		
	5,275	$11,037	$29,110,371
total	12,616		$50,535,664

ESTIMATED NATIONAL COST OF WELFARE EXPENDITURES FROM INADEQUATE EDUCATION

	1985 (thousands)	cost per recepient
AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN	$17,727,323	
MEDICAL ASSISTANCE (AFDC's share)	$9,731,719	
GENERAL ASSISTANCE	$2,049,477	
FOOD STAMPS	$12,907,085	
PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TOTAL	$42,415,604	$11,037
UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION	$19,554,483	$5,837
UPPER ESTIMATE:		
50% OF TOTAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	$21,207,802	
25% OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION	$4,888,621	
UPPER ESTIMATE TOTAL	$26,096,423	
LOWER ESTIMATE :		
25% OF TOTAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	$10,603,901	
15% OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION	$2,933,172	
LOWER ESTIMATE TOTAL	$13,537,073	
MIDPOINT ESTIMATE (MILLIONS)	$19,816,748	

relationship with the educational level of the recipient. Despite the fact that people who have never held jobs or who only work infrequently are not eligible for benefits (since benefits are related to previous earnings) and people with low earnings receive low benefits, unemployment compensation costs are associated with insufficient education. The "marginal" worker, the one with the least skills, is most susceptible to unemployment during poor economic times. Further, because of limited skills, he is less able to adapt to new technology or look for employment in other fields. Thus, inadequate education is a partial cause of unemployment compensation expenditures.

On a national basis, inadequate education is estimated to be responsible for between $14.5 billion and $21.2 billion in welfare expenditures. The Panel estimates inadequate education will be responsible for about $50.5 million in annual welfare expenditures for the Dropouts of the Class of 1982. Of this amount, $21.4 million will be expended in unemployment compensation and $29.1 million in Public Assistance aid(see chart).

Methodology

Only those welfare costs mentioned in the narrative were included and only 25% of medical assistance was calculated to be the share borne by AFDC. The total Public Assistance cost was divided by the number of families receiving AFDC payments to obtain a rate per family. This rate was adjusted for inflation and multiplied against half the number of female Dropouts, the number estimated to qualify for AFDC. The rate per person receiving unemployment compensation was calculated similarly and multiplied by half the number of male Dropouts, the number estimated to qualify for unemployment.

3. Costs of Crime

There is a great deal of research which links crime to inadequate education and which specifically links high school Dropouts to juvenile crime. In studying the national economic impact of crime and related expenditures, only crimes which were likely to decline if educational attainment were raised and which also caused a real sacrifice to the nation's resources were considered. Levin's estimate (adjusted to the current period) is that the economic impact of crime and related expenditures attributable to inadequate education ranged between $5.6 billion and $11.4 billion annually.

It is estimated, on the basis of some longitudinal research on children at educational risk, that 51% of male students who became Dropouts will be arrested. Costs for crime and related expenditures were calculated per arrest. If 51% of the Dropouts of the Class of 1982 are arrested, the

TABLE 42

ESTIMATED COST OF CRIME

RACE	CLASS OF 1982 DROPOUT NUMBER	ESTIMATED COST OF CRIME ATTRIBUTED TO THE CLASS OF 1982 DROPOUTS	
MALE			
WHITE	1,250		
BLACK	4,995		
HISP	1,096		
	7,341	total males	7,341
FEMALE			
WHITE	919		x 51%
BLACK	3,645		
HISP	711		x $19,663
	19,957		$73,615,372 if 51% of males committed crime

NATIONAL ECONOMIC IMPACT OF CRIME AND RELATED EXPENDITURES*

	UNITED STATES 1985 (millions)	
COST OF CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS AND PROPERTY:		
HOMICIDE	$2,359	
ASSAULT	204	COST PER
ARSON AND VANDALISM	944	ARREST
total	$3,507	$19,663
PUBLIC LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE:		
POLICE	$8,781	
CORRECTIONS	3,252	
PROSECUTION AND DEFENSE	392	
COURTS	821	
total	$13,247	
PRIVATE COSTS		
PREVENTION SERVICES	$4,246	
PREVENTION EQUIPMENT	629	
PRIVATE COUNSEL	189	
INSURANCE	944	
	$6,007	
TOTAL (MILLIONS)	$22,760	

economic impact of crime attributable to inadequate education, including the costs of crimes against persons and property, the associated costs of public law enforcement and criminal justice, and other private losses related to crime are in excess of $73.6 million.

Methodology

Levin's methodology was adjusted for inflation. However, these figures are conservative because they do not account for the increase in the crime rate which has occurred. Thus, the upper estimates of the costs of crime are likely to be more accurate. The costs attributable to the Class of 1982 were calculated by dividing the cost of crime by the number of arrests in those crime categories, and multiplying this rate (cost per arrest) by 51% of the male Dropouts of the Class of 1982. The cost to society for each of these committed crimes is calculated at $19,663 per arrest.

VI. METHODOLOGY

This report is a longitudinal study of entering freshmen who belonged to the graduating classes of 1982, 1983, and 1984, conducted jointly by the Chicago Panel on Public School Finances and the Department of Research and Evaluation of the Chicago Board of Education. It tracked each entering student by his/her student identification number, noting significant personal characteristics on each file (race, age at entry, gender, and school of entry), and identified the final leave code recorded, and the school from which the student left. Eighth grade reading scores for these students were retrieved from other files and merged with the basic student identification files. The various possible leave codes were combined into three categories: Transfers (primarily those who transfered out of the Chicago Public Schools, but also including those who died -- just over 40 in each of the three classes studied -- or were committed to some residential institution), Graduates, and Dropouts (those who left without graduating or transferring to an accredited day high school, for any of the 13 reasons mentioned in the introduction--see Appendix for a list of all Leave Codes currently used by the Chicago Public Schools). Each student was then tracked from entry to departure.

The Transfer Rate was determined by dividing the total number of students classified under the combined Transfer codes by the total number of entering freshmen. The Dropout and Graduation Rates were then determined by dividing the number of students in each of those combined categories by the number of students remaining after the Transfers were eliminated. In the course of this study, it was not possible to determine final outcomes of those students who transferred out of the Chicago Public Schools; therefore, these students were excluded from Dropout and Graduation Rates.

Data Collection and Data Problems

In the course of this study, more than 100,000 student records were examined. Individual records were examined only by qualified employees of the Chicago Board of Education. No confidential individual information was disclosed to non-employees. Staff from the Chicago Panel analyzed only aggregate data. These data were drawn from the Board's student data files. Student information and reading scores were drawn from separately maintained files, which prevented an exact match on all files. These files are centrally maintained on the basis of data entry at the local school level. Thus, the data contained in this study represent the most specific, and most accurate, student information available.

Previous efforts to analyze the scope of the Dropout problem in the Chicago Public Schools have suffered from an imprecise data base. This is particularly true for those outside studies which have sought to estimate the Dropout Rate from aggregate enrollment data. The Illinois State Board of Education attrition rate suffers from the same imprecision. These estimates are particularly vulnerable to distortion resulting from the inability to track transfers out of the system and the inability to distinguish between newly entering students and those retained (particularly in the freshman year) from previous entering classes. By using computerized individual tracking, this study is able to avoid both of these problems.

However, data problems still exist in using this method. Any large, computerized data base suffers from some common problems. Data entry errors are inevitable when dealing with the records of more than 100,000 students. Some students' records are incorrectly coded; others are missing one or more codes. Thus, for the different student characteristics analyzed in this study, the class size will vary (e.g., a small difference for gender vs. race). For most categories, the number of missing codes is quite low. The largest problem of missing information resulted from merging the reading score file with the basic student information file. A mismatch of student identification numbers became an arena for error. However, there are also other reasons for missing reading scores, including those who transferred into the Chicago Public Schools as freshmen (thus, having no recorded eighth grade score), those judged too limited in English proficiency to be tested in English, and those who were absent on the day the tests were administered.

A more serious problem is the purposeful miscoding of students. Various school officials, in order to manipulate the official Dropout Rate, may code students incorrectly. Combining the various codes for leaving school without graduating eliminated one potential abuse of hiding the true scope of droping out by choosing a less pejorative designation than Dropout. The most flagrant abuse of the leave codes was found among those students recorded as Transfers. A visual examination of the destinations of all such students indicated that as many as 50% were recorded improperly, either to destinations which did not exist or to destinations which were not accredited diploma granting high schools. For this study, these students were recategorized as Dropouts. Still, because the Board of Education does not routinely and systematically verify that students transferring are actually enrolled in a proper high school destination, even some of these remaining Transfers may never arrive. In the future, such verification should be standard procedure, and those not enrolled in an accredited school should be counted as Dropouts. However, this problem does not appear to significantly affect the

Dropout Rate identified in this study. Even if 20% of the remaining students recorded as Transfers did not arrive at their destination, the Dropout Rate would rise by less than 1%.

A longitudinal study presents particular data problems not inherent in annual accountings. These problems enhance the reliability of such an approach, but create timing problems for reporting on Dropouts. Annual longitudinal Dropout Rates will provide information on student outcomes for the preceeding four to six years. This study has not developed procedures for interim reporting on classes still enrolled in high school, though such procedures do not appear to be difficult to develop. However, a longitudinal approach discloses a pattern in student enrollment which is often overlooked in Dropout studies: about 10% of Chicago high school students are still actively enrolled after their class has graduated. Thus, final statistics are not available for some time after the normal graduating date of a class. This study uses a cut-off date of September 30th two years following the normal graduation date. Data from the Class of 1982 indicate that less than one-half of one percent were still enrolled at that point. However, this means that "final" statistics are not available until two years after a class graduates. Such a delay would seriously compromise the value of longitudinal data. Happily, it also appears that those students who are still actively enrolled on September 30th of the year their class graduated have outcomes very close to those of the class as a whole. Thus, a fairly accurate proximate Dropout Rate may be determined at that point. For comparisons between classes only recently graduated (specifically the Classes of 1983 and 1984 in this study), a cut-off date of September 30th following graduation, excluding those still actively enrolled, produces significant findings.

Various student characteristics were examined in conjunction with the Dropout Rate. Gender distinctions between males and females were analyzed. Race and ethnicity were examined on the basis of the Board of Education's categories: White, Black, American Indian (generally too few in numbers to make comparisons significant), Asian, and Hispanic. Entry age of students was calculated on the basis of a December 1 cut-off, following Illinois state practice at that time; thus, students who were older than 14 by December 1st of their entering year were considered overage. No data were available on the student information file to indicate socio-economic status. Reading scores were those recorded by the Board of Education as a result of Iowa Basic Skills Tests administered in April of the year preceeding high school entry. Following generally accepted educational guidelines, students testing at Stanine 4 and above were considered to be reading at or above normal reading levels for entry into high

school. Those with scores in Stanines 1 - 3 were considered below normal. Grade equivalents for national norm referenced tests are somewhat misleading, but are provided here. Students tested in the eighth month of their eighth year in school (April of 8th grade) should show a grade equivalence of 8.8. However, since norm referenced tests are designed to show a range of scores which are considered normal, a grade equivalence of 6.8 would be considered the lower limit of a normal reading level for entering freshmen. Stanine and grade equivalents used in this study are:

	Grade Equivalents	
Stanine 1	0.5 - 4.6	
Stanine 2	4.7 - 5.7	Below Normal
Stanine 3	5.8 - 6.7	
Stanine 4	6.8 - 8.0	
Stanine 5	8.1 - 9.2	Normal and Above
Stanine 6 and above	9.3 -13.9	

One final word is necessary to compare the effects of doing a longitudinal study rather than a one-time annual report. Recently, the Board of Education released a set of Dropout statistics for each high school in the system for the Class of 1984. The rule of thumb comparison for one-time statistics vs. a longitudinal study has been to multiply the annual statistics by four to arrive at a rough approximation of the Dropout Rate for the high school career of an individual Class. On the accompanying chart, the results of these two different means of computing the Dropout Rate are presented, both absolutely, as released, and with the fourfold multiplication. There are significant differences for a number of schools. However, it must be noted that, because the data for this longitudinal study has been more rigorously examined and cleaned, some of the differences reflect the elimination of some abuses mentioned above. Thus, Crane High School, which reported a 1.9% annual Dropout Rate last February (comparable to a 7.6% rate for four years) has a Dropout Rate of 58.3% according to the statistics gathered for this report. Generally, those schools whose reported Dropout statistics were quite high look better on a rigorous longitudinal approach. Uneven temporal distribution of a school's Dropouts (e.g., if a school loses many in the first two years) will tend to inflate the numbers when they are simply multiplied by four. On the other hand, those schools which incorrectly categorized transfers (recorded to inappropriate or non-existent destinations) or narrowly defined Dropout to only one of the 13 appropriate leave codes, generally had much higher Dropout Rates according to the data in this study.

DROPOUT STUDY OF CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS — COMPARING LONGITUDINAL DATA WITH OFFICIALLY REPORTED DROPOUT RATES — TABLE 43

School Level Data - Class of 1984

RANK	UNIT #	SCHOOL NAME	ENTER TOTAL 1984	CLASS OF 1984 DROPOUT	DROP RATE 1984	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	REPORTED DROPOUTS THIS YEAR	RECORDED DROPOUT RATE	ESTIMATED DROPOUTS FOUR YEARS (D/O x 4)	ESTIMATED DROPOUT RATE (Rate x 4)	DIFFERENCE LONG'L vs ANNUAL
1	1220	Austin #	139	71	55.5%	1,652	410	24.8%	1,640	99.2%	-43.7%
2	1280	DuSable	564	334	62.5%	2,264	467	20.6%	1,868	82.4%	-19.9%
3	1510	Phillips	470	279	61.6%	2,006	408	20.3%	1,632	81.2%	-19.6%
4	1640	Wells	344	173	60.3%	1,769	358	20.2%	1,432	80.8%	-20.5%
5	1460	Manley	341	200	62.3%	1,225	242	19.8%	968	79.2%	-16.9%
6	1300	Farragut	327	182	60.3%	2,060	390	18.9%	1,560	75.6%	-15.3%
7	1400	Kelly	325	157	52.2%	1,788	330	18.5%	1,320	74.0%	-21.8%
8	1670	Hubbard	312	117	42.1%	1,226	207	16.9%	828	67.6%	-25.5%
9	1830	Orr	420	204	55.4%	2,122	359	16.9%	1,436	67.6%	-12.2%
10	1530	Schurz	736	298	46.6%	3,267	501	15.3%	2,004	61.2%	-14.6%
11	1890	Juarez	336	143	47.5%	1,865	279	15.0%	1,116	50.0%	-12.5%
12	1360	Harper	310	140	49.8%	1,242	185	14.9%	740	59.6%	-9.8%
13	1340	Gage Park	240	105	46.5%	1,458	215	14.7%	860	58.8%	-12.3%
14	1380	Hirsh	323	151	55.1%	906	127	14.0%	508	56.0%	-0.9%
15	1570	Sullivan	270	96	42.1%	993	135	13.6%	540	54.4%	-12.3%
16	1760	King,M.L.	351	150	45.7%	1,333	173	13.0%	692	52.0%	-6.3%
17	1430	Lakeview	308	147	54.6%	1,219	150	12.3%	600	49.2%	-5.4%
18	1840	Clemente	830	356	51.2%	3,573	438	12.3%	1,752	49.2%	2.0%
19	1520	Roosevelt	407	151	43.1%	1,747	201	11.5%	804	46.0%	-2.9%
20	1210	Amundsen	349	125	42.2%	1,481	169	11.4%	676	45.6%	-3.4%
21	1590	Tilden	327	129	49.0%	1,631	172	10.5%	688	42.0%	7.0%
22	1330	Foreman	280	85	36.3%	1,388	137	10.0%	548	40.0%	-3.7%
23	1560	Steinmetz	520	137	29.4%	2,216	219	9.9%	876	39.6%	-10.2%
24	1420	Kennedy	374	111	31.2%	1,622	155	9.6%	620	38.4%	-7.2%
25	1410	Kelvyn Park	410	167	49.3%	1,900	177	9.3%	708	37.2%	12.1%
26	1350	Harlan	405	127	34.6%	1,547	144	9.3%	576	37.2%	-2.6%
27	1550	South Shore	442	230	56.5%	1,930	159	8.2%	636	32.8%	23.7%
28	1050	Near No. Career Magn	3	2	66.7%	1,060	85	8.0%	340	32.0%	34.7%
29	1850	Carver	438	193	49.2%	1,588	119	7.5%	476	30.0%	19.2%
30	1470	Marshall	462	219	53.5%	2,054	148	7.2%	592	28.8%	24.7%
31	1820	Curie	719	193	29.2%	3,333	240	7.2%	960	28.8%	0.4%
32	1680	Englewood	337	147	46.1%	1,662	113	6.8%	452	27.2%	18.9%
33	1240	Bowen	501	193	44.3%	2,178	146	6.7%	584	26.8%	17.5%
34	1610	Von Steuben	205	60	32.1%	1,039	67	6.4%	268	25.6%	6.5%
35	1620	Lincoln Park	415	156	42.7%	1,646	104	6.3%	416	25.2%	17.5%
36	1070	Prosser Voc	323	66	22.4%	1,363	84	6.2%	336	24.8%	-2.4%
37	1580	Taft	429	59	14.7%	2,024	126	6.2%	504	24.8%	-10.1%
38	1630	Washington	341	69	22.8%	1,768	106	6.0%	424	24.0%	-1.2%
39	1160	Westinghouse Voc	309	74	25.7%	1,570	90	5.7%	360	22.8%	2.9%
40	1150	Simeon Voc	552	163	31.0%	1,831	96	5.4%	384	21.6%	9.4%
41	1490	Morgan Park	422	107	28.5%	1,944	98	5.0%	392	20.0%	8.5%
42	1020	Cregier Voc	150	95	71.4%	730	36	4.9%	144	19.6%	51.8%
43	1310	Fenger	463	166	42.1%	1,928	89	4.6%	356	18.4%	23.7%
44	1880	Collins	461	226	53.1%	1,695	78	4.6%	312	18.4%	34.7%
45	1110	Richards Voc	205	72	38.5%	823	36	4.4%	144	17.6%	20.9%
46	1440	Lane	1,065	137	14.3%	4,685	192	4.1%	768	16.4%	-2.1%
47	1540	Senn	620	212	40.5%	2,610	96	3.7%	384	14.8%	25.7%
48	1010	Chicago Voc.	977	234	26.1%	3,747	122	3.3%	488	13.2%	12.9%
49	1390	Hyde Park	563	186	36.0%	2,818	82	2.9%	328	11.6%	24.4%
50	1230	Bogan	335	59	18.3%	1,928	49	2.5%	196	10.0%	8.3%
51	1870	Julian	598	138	25.2%	2,173	53	2.4%	212	9.6%	15.6%
52	1480	Mather	290	51	19.2%	1,705	39	2.3%	156	9.2%	10.0%
53	1030	Dunbar Voc	523	108	23.1%	2,497	55	2.2%	220	8.8%	14.3%
54	1270	Crane	376	193	58.3%	1,917	37	1.9%	148	7.6%	50.7%
55	1710	Kenwood	525	99	21.3%	2,250	37	1.6%	148	6.4%	14.9%
56	1660	Corliss	486	123	28.4%	2,010	32	1.6%	128	6.4%	22.0%
57	1250	Calumet	338	162	52.6%	1,501	23	1.5%	92	6.0%	46.6%
58	1040	Flower Voc	207	80	40.8%	634	6	1.0%	24	4.0%	36.8%
59	1320	Robeson	402	199	56.7%	1,761	11	0.6%	44	2.4%	54.3%
60	1810	Young	471	59	13.8%	2,195	5	0.3%	20	1.2%	12.6%
61	1450	Lindblom	568	68	14.0%	2,133	4	0.2%	16	0.8%	13.2%
62	1800	Metro, Chicago	56	14	29.8%			*	0	0.0%	29.8%
63	1370	Harrison +	309	134	51.5%				0	0.0%	51.5%

VII. APPENDIX

CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION

Leave Codes

Code	Use
30	Intra School Reorganization (e.g., Promotion)
31	Transfer to another C.P.S. (full time)
32	Transfer to a Chicago non-public school (or evening school)
33	Transfer to a school out of Chicago
34	Transfer to a residential institution
35	Legally committed to a correctional institution
36	Lost - not coming to school - truant officer cannot locate
37	Temporarily excused due to physical disability
38	Temporarily excused due to certified mental retardation
39	Temporarily excused due to certified emotional disturbance
41	Deceased
42	Terminated (student was in an ungraded program)
44	Miscellaneous leave for involuntary reason (including pregnancy)
45	Graduated from high school
60	Entered verified employment
61	Needed at home
62	Enlisted
63	Married
64	Dropout - lack of interest and/or poor scholarship
65	Cannot adjust